1 INDEX 3 Government witnesses JAMES FOSTER 4 5 Direct Examination By Mr. Suedekum ......8 Cross-Examination By Mr. Farmer ......34 6 Redirect Examination By Mr. Suedekum .......57 Recross-Examination By Mr. Farmer ......61 MICHAEL ETHERIDGE 8 Direct Examination By Mr. Suedekum ......65 9 Cross-Examination By Mr. Farmer ......73 Redirect Examination By Mr. Suedekum ......79 10 11 Defense witness 12 GARY WADDEY 13 Direct Examination By Mr. Farmer .....82 Cross-Examination By Mr. Suedekum .....92 14 15 EXHIBITS 16 Government No. 1....warrant affidavit ............61 17 18 Defense No. 1....Incident Report No. 2020-0187135 .65 19 dated 3-1-2020 Defense No. 2....Email from Fred Thomas dated .....85 5-19-2020 2.0 Defense No. 3....Photo of table holding multiple ..89 2.1 items, papers, lighters, game controller, etc. 22 23 2.4

The above-styled cause came to be heard on May 19, 2020, before the Hon. Barbara D. Holmes, Magistrate Judge, when the following proceedings were had to-wit:

## TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC RECORDING

\*\*\*

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: I see the marshal, now I see -- I think we have everyone on. Can you all hear me? If you would just nod your heads if you can hear me. All right. Everyone's nodding their head. I'm going to ask everyone to mute their line because we are getting some feedback.

All right. And then I'm going to go ahead and call the case and we'll start the rest of this afternoon's proceedings. We are here in the matter of the *United States versus Robert Ellis*Waddey, No. 3:17-00025. All right. We have -- now we've lost Mr. Suedekum. Let's see if Mr. Suedekum rejoins.

And, again, if everybody would mute their line. There we go. That's better. We've lost Mr. Suedekum again. All right. I'm going to have everybody reload. If you will go up to the refresh or

reload symbol in the top left-hand corner that looks like a half circle with an arrow and click that, and if everybody would reload, then we'll see if we can resolve some of these feedback issues.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

All right. That seems to have worked.

Can everybody see and hear? We lost Mr. -- all right.

We have a witness back. All right. All right.

Again, if everybody would keep our system muted.

We are here in the matter of the United States versus Robert Ellis Waddey,
No. 3:17-00025. On behalf of the government we have
Assistant United States Attorney Chris Suedekum, and
on behalf Mr. Waddey, we have Jonathan Farmer.

All right. Let's take care of a couple of housekeeping things and then we'll get into the substance of the hearing. Mr. Farmer, have you had an opportunity to talk with Mr. Waddey about proceeding today by video conference? Mr. Farmer? I need you to -- go ahead and unmute, if you would.

MR. FARMER: I can hear you now.

THE COURT: Yes, and I'll have you mute it again in a moment because there's a lot of feedback, but have you had an opportunity to talk with Mr. Waddey about proceeding by video today?

I think he's trying to do it on a phone.

1 Mr. Farmer, have you had an opportunity 2 to talk with Mr. Waddey about proceeding by video 3 today? 4 MR. FARMER: Yes, I have. We've 5 discussed proceeding via the preliminary hearing and 6 the detention hearing by video. And we consent to do 7 the same. 8 THE COURT: Is there anyone that's using 9 two devices that might be interfering with each other, 10 like a phone and a laptop? Okay. Well, that seems to 11 have solved whatever the problem was for the moment. 12 All right. But I am hearing a lot of 13 feedback, so if you would just keep your devices 14 muted. And we've lost Mr. Farmer again. 15 Mr. Waddey, let me ask you a question, 16 Robert Waddey, would you have any opposition to 17 Mr. Farmer participating by telephone rather than by 18 video? 19 THE DEFENDANT: If he thinks that would 2.0 be a good idea, no, ma'am, I do not. 2.1 THE COURT: And do you --22 THE DEFENDANT: I don't have any 2.3 objection. 2.4 THE COURT: And do you consent proceeding 25 today by video or telephonically?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right. Hold on just a 3 I'm going to mute my line and I'm going to 4 have my courtroom deputy call Mr. Farmer or email him 5 and have him participate by phone. 6 THE DEFENDANT: Okay, yes, ma'am, 7 Your Honor. 8 (Pause in proceedings.) 9 THE COURT: All right. We're just --10 we're seeing about Mr. Farmer dialing in. Mr. Farmer, 11 are you on the line? 12 MR. FARMER: Hello. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Farmer, is that you? 14 MR. FARMER: It is me, yes. 15 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Waddey is 16 agreeable to you participating by telephone, but I am 17 going to ask you to mute your line until I talk to you 18 because we're getting a lot of interference again. 19 I know it's not anything you're doing, Mr. Farmer, but 2.0 I think it's at your end where we're having some of 2.1 these issues, so if you can mute your line and then --22 I already -- this is, again, the matter of the 2.3 United States versus Robert Ellis Waddey, 2.4 No. 3:17-00025. We are proceeding by video today for 25 the preliminary hearing and detention hearing in

connection with the petition for warrant for offender on supervision.

And because Mr. Waddey is a supervised releasee, Mr. Farmer, it is your — it is his burden to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence, of course, that there's a basis for release. It is the government's burden with respect to the preliminary hearing.

So I think because it is the government's burden on the preliminary hearing, Mr. Suedekum, I'm going to have you go first. And then we'll hear from Mr. Farmer as to any proof that he has with respect to detention.

So, Mr. Suedekum, are you ready to proceed?

MR. SUEDEKUM: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. If you'd go ahead, then, sir.

MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I do have two witnesses. The first witness is probation officer James Foster.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Foster, if you would raise your right hand for me, please.

2.0

2.1

2.3

1 JAMES FOSTER called as a witness, after having been first duly 2 3 sworn, testified as follows: THE COURT: I'm going to need you to 4 5 unmute for just a moment, Mr. Foster. 6 THE WITNESS: Yes. 7 THE COURT: So you do swear to tell the 8 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. 9 Swear or affirm, all right. And then Mr. Foster, you 10 can lower your hand. And if you'd state your name for 11 us, please. 12 THE WITNESS: James Foster. 13 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, 14 Mr. Suedekum. 15 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. SUEDEKUM: DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 17 BY MR. SUEDEKUM: 18 Mr. Foster, are you currently supervising Ο. 19 Mr. Waddey? 2.0 Α. That's correct. 2.1 And how long have you been the Ο. 22 supervising probation officer for him? 2.3 I've been supervising Mr. Waddey since Α. 2.4 approximately September of 2019. 25 And did you say 2018 or 2019? 0.

- A. 2019. Mr. Waddey was previously supervised by other probation officers in the office.
- Q. Okay. I want to begin by talking about the petition that you submitted to the Court. In or around March 20 of 2020, did you submit a petition to the Court for action regarding Mr. Waddey?
  - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. And what was the basis of your petition?
- A. The basis of the petition consists of three violations. First violation being that at that time Mr. Waddey had been charged with a misdemeanor, domestic assault out of Davidson County. The second violation alleged instances of admitted and drug tests (indiscernible) marijuana use. And third violation of admissions of alcohol use.
- Q. And with respect to the petition, was the information that you put in the petition, do you believe that to be true and accurate to the best of your knowledge?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. With respect to the first alleged violation, could you just describe the basic facts as you understood them that led to the arrest affidavit for domestic assault?
  - A. Yes. Briefly, the Metropolitan Nashville

Police Department received a phone call on the evening of March 15 from Mr. Waddey's girlfriend, Andrea Stone, alleging a domestic incident. Police came to the scene and interviewed both Mr. Waddey and Ms. Stone. Ms. Stone alleged, in essence, that she and Mr. Waddey had been physically scuffling during which his foot broke her jaw. Mr. Waddey gave a more brief but silently different explanation during which he admitted they were scuffling, but he terminated his account of events apparently earlier than Ms. Stone did.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Police left the scene after counseling both individuals on domestic violence issues.

Mr. Waddey -- no charges were pressed that evening.

Mr. Waddey reportedly left the incident -- or left the residence and then stayed with his parents that night.

It appears that on the 16th, in relation to the same alleged course of conduct, Ms. Stones requested a temporary order of protection, which was issued, prohibiting Mr. Waddey from having any threatening or other contact with her or their children. And on the 17th, Ms. Stones — or Ms. Stone requested a domestic assault charge, which was sworn out against Mr. Waddey, that being the aforementioned misdemeanor domestic assault charge. And that warrant

existed and was in place until his recent arrest earlier this month.

- Q. And did a state court judge find probable cause and issue an arrest warrant for the domestic assault incident?
  - A. Yes.

2.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. And to summarize Ms. Stone's allegation, she said that at some point that they were wrestling or doing MMA-style moves together; is that right?
- A. Yes. As stated in the petition, we allege that earlier on the same evening, that would be March 15, Mr. Waddey had been consuming alcohol and watching movies. She stated that he occasionally liked to act out such films and also that they had, of late, been learning Brazilian jujitsu together and they sometimes practiced together, but he allegedly sometimes took it, quote, too far.

On the evening in question, she alleged that they'd been practicing martial arts (indiscernible) on their bed and that she had wished to conclude that practice but Mr. Waddey would not. She stated that she broke out of several of the holds that he was using upon her (indiscernible) pinned her down several more times. And that in the course of her breaking one of his holds, his foot allegedly

struck her jaw.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. And she went to the police two days later. Did she report that her jaw was still hurt?
- A. If I may, I would need to refer to that document.
- Q. Do you have a copy of the domestic assault affidavit that she signed?
  - A. I do. I'm reading it now.

MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, this is the affidavit that I'd provided to the Court and Mr. Waddey's counsel prior to the hearing.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: According to the affidavit, the alleged victim, Ms. Stone, stated that Mr. Waddey would become violent when he consumed alcohol. She stated that on the evening of the 15th of March, Mr. Waddey was intoxicated. They entered into a scuffle, after which he put her into an ankle lock. She stated that she had been able to free herself by kicking him off.

She stated that she kicked him off, but he continued to pursue her and pin her down on the bed with his knees and that she was able to again kick him off, but in that moment he broke her jaw with his foot. She stated that the actions were unwanted and

that she had, instead of doing these things, wanted to go to sleep. She claims that she had repeatedly told Mr. Waddey to stop, but he did not stop. And she stated that while there was no visible injury, her jaw continued to hurt.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. All right. And at some point did you obtain a copy of the police report from March 15 when police officers responded to their home?
- A. Yes. In the days immediately following the alleged incident, I obtained first a copy of the incident report. The document that I was just quoting a moment ago, the affidavit, I obtained that three days ago because those documents had remained sealed (indiscernible) Mr. Waddey's state warrant (indiscernible).
- Q. Did Mr. Waddey, from your review of the police report, speak to police on the night of March 15?
- A. According to the incident report, he did speak to them on that evening.
- Q. And according to the incident report, did Mr. Waddey give a different version of events from what Ms. Stones had said had happened?
- A. Mr. Waddey stated that he and Ms. Stones had been practicing Brazilian jujitsu on their bed

where Ms. Stone attempted to place him into an ankle lock. He stated that he reversed that attempt and then put her into an ankle lock, at which time she claimed that he had hurt her ankle.

But according to the incident report,
Mr. Waddey's statements did not go beyond that, as he
declined to answer any further question regarding the
event.

- Q. When you spoke to Mr. Waddey a day or two later -- and I believe this is set forth in the petition -- did Mr. Waddey provide you a different version of events from what he had told police, according to the police report?
  - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. When you spoke to Mr. Waddey a day or two later, what was the new version of events that he shared with you, that he claimed had happened?
- A. I spoke to Mr. Waddey on the 16th. He stated that he and Ms. Stones had been arguing frequently in the week prior to the alleged domestic assault and also alleged that (indiscernible) COVID-19 pandemic had not been able to obtain some of her psychiatric medication. He stated that on the evening of the 15th after they put their two children to bed, he and Ms. Stones engaged in, quote, rough sex, during

which, at Ms. Stones' request, he, quote, choked her some.

He stated that she began to object to that activity and accused him of, quote, being too rough, which led to a verbal argument between the two, after which she called police. Mr. Waddey stated that after the police had departed the residence, he left and stayed at his parents' residence where he consumed an unspecified quantity of alcohol that evening.

- Q. Turning your attention to the third alleged violation, is it your testimony that Mr. Waddey admitted to you that he had consumed alcohol on the night of March 15th?
- A. Yes. His admission of using alcohol was after he went to his parents' residence. I don't believe he made an admission about alcohol abuse prior to the alleged event with Ms. Stone.
- Q. Fair enough. At some point, though, he admitted to you that at some point that evening he had consumed alcohol?
  - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. And one of the conditions of his supervised release is that he's not allowed to consume any alcohol; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.

Q. To your knowledge was this the only occasion on which Mr. Waddey consumed alcohol while he's been on supervised release?

A. No.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Q. Did Ms. Stones, in her report to police and in her domestic violence affidavit, did she indicate that Mr. Waddey occasionally drank alcohol in her presence?

A. Yes.

Q. Above and beyond what Ms. Stones reported, are you aware of any other occasion while on supervised release that Mr. Waddey has either consumed alcohol or an occasion for which you suspected him of consuming alcohol?

A. Yes.

Q. If you would, could you please elaborate as to any occasions that you're aware of?

A. Yes. In March of 2019, prior to when I initiated supervision of Mr. Waddey, he had what he admitted as a significant alcohol relapse, which was followed by inpatient treatment for alcohol use.

Later during the evaluation that was conducted in August 19th — or August 2019, he admitted having consumed alcohol after he left inpatient treatment.

Mr. Waddey also admitted on August the 14th that he

had consumed alcohol, specifically vodka, on the evening of August 12 and August 13.

- Q. As a result of these or other incidents, has Mr. Waddey been referred to alcohol or other substance abuse counseling or treatment?
  - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. Based on your conversations with him and with any therapist, what do you know about whether or not those sessions have been helpful to Mr. Waddey in coping with his use of alcohol?
- A. My understanding is that at times, based on Mr. Waddey's self-report, he had stated that the treatment has been helpful. Based on his continued use of alcohol, I don't think it's been helpful in helping him to abstain completely.

To answer your earlier question regarding his treatment, Mr. Waddey has been in some form of outpatient treatment virtually the entire time that he's been on supervised release, primarily outpatient counseling through Dr. Gary Wilson, which continued until, I believe, as late as earlier this year.

He's also received psychiatric medication through Dr. Kent Kyger. Specifically for alcohol, Mr. Waddey did, in April of 2019, attend a multi-day inpatient detox hospital at Rolling Hills Hospital.

And then I believe between June and July of the same year, he attended inpatient substance abuse treatment for approximately 30 days at Mirror Lake Recovery (indiscernible).

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Mr. Waddey was also referred in August of 2019 to assessments for further treatment at the Evelyn Frye Center. Those recommendations from the Frye Center indicated that he was not a good candidate for the type of treatment modality which they were hoping to work with him, which involved examination of prior — prior stressors, prior traumas.

My conversations with Mr. Waddey's aforementioned outpatient counselor, Dr. Gary Wilson, he believed that his work with Mr. Waddey was beneficial, believes that Mr. Waddey was somewhat opening up to him, but was also extremely paranoid and a severely emotional man, as he put it.

And Dr. Wilson stated that it was his opinion that any referrals to any other treatment would eventually be useless because he doubted that Mr. Waddey would ever open up to any other treatment providers or attend any form (indiscernible).

Q. Before we move on and talk about the issue regarding Mr. Waddey's release or detention, I want to also talk about the second alleged violation

regarding positive tests for the presence of THC. Are you aware of whether or not during the time Mr. Waddey has been on supervised release he has tested positive for THC?

A. Yes, he has.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. And is THC the chemical or compound that's present in marijuana?
- A. Yes. It's the psychoactive chemical present in cannabinoidal products, such as marijuana.
- Q. According to the petition, you indicate that Mr. Waddey tested positive, it appears, on several occasions; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. The most recent occasion listed is

  November 22 of 2019. Has Mr. Waddey continued to be
  drug tested since that time or is that the last time
  he was drug tested, to your knowledge?
- A. Mr. Waddey tested negative consistently between the end of November and between late February, which was the last drug test that the probation office conducted with Mr. Waddey prior to this hearing.
- Q. At some point between August 23, 2019, and November 22, 2019, did you have any conversations with Mr. Waddey about the fact that he was having these positive drug tests for marijuana?

A. Yes. Mr. Waddey and I discussed (indiscernible) virtually every one (indiscernible).

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. Did Mr. Waddey ever admit to consuming marijuana during these conversations?
- A. No, not specifically. Mr. Waddey emphatically denied having used marijuana, per se. However, Mr. Waddey claims that the only substance that he used he believed would account for his drug tests was CBD oil or hemp, which he claims to have legally purchased from various suppliers in Nashville.
- Q. What, if anything, did you advise him or respond to him regarding whether or not these these items would cause him to have THC present in his system?
- A. So I requested input from a national testing laboratory, the same laboratory that tests all the drug samples sent in by the probation office.

  That testing laboratory explained that to be legally available, hemp and CBD products must contain below a certain minimal threshold of THC.

Essentially, no product can be sold which has enough THC that it would be psychoactive. Or (indiscernible) upon this lab's test. The lab essentially was stating to me that they could not confirm or deny that Mr. Waddey might have been

purchasing hemp.

2.0

2.1

2.4

What the lab did tell me was that if Mr. Waddey was using only substances that he'd obtained legally, then whatever he was obtaining and using contained more than the legally permissible level of THC.

Mr. Waddey seemed very against making any admission of using marijuana. Therefore, I thought it was a dead end to try to lead him to any form of confession, so to speak. Instead, I explained to Mr. Waddey that it appeared, based on testing, that whatever he was using did not meet the definition of something that should be legally sold. Instead, (indiscernible) appeared to have illegal amounts of THC. Therefore, I encouraged him to stop using whatever it was that he was using.

- Q. Do you recall when it was you had this conversation with Mr. Waddey and warned him about this --
- A. These conversations took place on multiple occasions with exactly the same talking points between August and late November.
- Q. So at least one of these conversations occurred between you and Mr. Waddey, and then he thereafter tested positive for THC again; is that fair

1 to say? Α. Yes. MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I would ask 3 4 the Court, is it all right now if I transition to 5 discussing factors relevant to detention? Or do you 6 have anything further that you'd like to hear 7 regarding the alleged petition violations from 8 Mr. Foster? THE COURT: Well, are your questions 9 10 about detention of Mr. Foster as well? 11 MR. SUEDEKUM: Yes, I do have some 12 questions related to that. 13 THE COURT: Then go ahead and finish your 14 examination of Mr. Foster and then I'll let Mr. Farmer 15 cross-examine Mr. Foster for any purpose. 16 MR. SUEDEKUM: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 BY MR. SUEDEKUM: 18 Mr. Foster, on the whole, how would you Ο. 19 describe Mr. Waddey's behavior and compliance with the 2.0 conditions of his supervised release from October 2018 to the present? 2.1 22 I believe that Mr. Waddey has struggled Α. 23 with some conditions of supervised release. In some 2.4 areas, in terms of being willing to report to

probation and submit requested documentation, he's

been very good. Mr. Waddey's primary (indiscernible) has been in his use of substances. And I think that Mr. Waddey's willingness to engage in other forms of treatment or his ability to engage in other forms of treatment has been lacking.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Q. How has the current COVID-19 pandemic impacted -- first I want to ask you about Mr. Waddey's behavior while he's on been supervised release during the pandemic, and then I want to specifically ask you about how the pandemic has affected your ability to continue to supervise him.

So first, can you talk a little bit about Mr. Waddey's behavior during the past few months specifically?

A. Okay. I would preface this by stating that since I've met Mr. Waddey, according to records for virtually the entire time Mr. Waddey has been under supervision, even before Mr. Waddey (indiscernible) several individuals, including treatment providers and myself an abiding interest and concern about what has been described by some writers as real political concerns, future war, fear of the future, concerns about government and conspiracies, bordering on paranoia.

How this -- how the COVID-19 pandemic

appears to have affected Mr. Waddey is, from what I have heard, very poor. Mr. Waddey, from about the time of the 15th of March until late April, maintained regular, if not daily, near daily conversation with me for several weeks. I preface this, again, by stating that normally once a warrant has been issued for an individual's arrest, the probation office pulls back on certain supervision elements in order to make room for the marshals to be able to execute the warrant.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

In this case Mr. Waddey, unbeknownst to him, after the 17th and then again on the 19th simultaneously (indiscernible) warrants which he wasn't aware of. Even within the days between the 15th and the 19th, Mr. Waddey's conversations with me indicated that he seemed deeply troubled by the COVID-19 pandemic. He seemed to be emotionally struggling and paranoid; therefore, I maintained regular contact with him.

And over the course of those days and weeks, it appeared to me that Mr. Waddey became more and more concerned, became more and more paranoid. It seemed that his social interactions with others were falling away and were limited. He expressed feelings of fear and anxiety and stress regarding his family and their health; loneliness regarding his girlfriend

having left. Uncertainty about his job, uncertainty about his health status.

2.0

2.1

2.4

In fact, on two different occasions

Mr. Waddey believed he himself had contracted

COVID-19, and during the latter one of those, based on

his own description, he may well have, but I don't

believe at any point he tested positive or submitted

himself for testing.

Overall I think that it affected him in a pronounced way in that it played upon many of his preexisting concerns and ideas and I would say interests bordering on obsession, those being surviving such a possible outcome, surviving what he believed would be the collapse of society.

- Q. Did Mr. Waddey make any request to you about wanting to leave his residence perhaps related to the pandemic?
- A. Yes. On more than one occasion, I believe on approximately the 18th, only a few days after the incident with his girlfriend, Mr. Waddey asked if I would allow him to relocate to an undisclosed wooded location (indiscernible) Middle Tennessee. On its face I realize that that request was a bad idea, but I denied that request.

I talked with Mr. Waddey about it as

logically as I could, asking him, where would you stay, how could I supervise you if you were somewhere else. Where would you even want to go. Mr. Waddey humored my question, but he told me that he wouldn't tell me where he wanted to go. It seemed that that defeated the purpose of wanting to go to an undisclosed location. Again, I told him that wasn't possible and encouraged him to stay put. In fact, I had to claim to Mr. Waddey that if he were to leave his address permanently or semi-permanently, I was no longer able to locate him, I would be obligated to inform the Court and a warrant for his arrest must surely be issued.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Even after that discussion, Mr. Waddey asked me for that permission on, I believe, two more occasions during the month of March and as late as, I believe, April (indiscernible) asked for permission to, quote, get the fuck out of Dodge and hang out at an undisclosed location during the COVID-19 pandemic.

- Q. Mr. Foster, to -- I will state, to
  Mr. Waddey's credit, when you told him he wasn't
  allowed to do that, did he say that he would agree
  to -- he wouldn't do it then?
- A. Mr. Waddey stated during most of those conversations that he would try to follow the advice

that I was giving him, yes.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. And to your knowledge did he ever attempt to leave and go out to an undisclosed location or was he still living at his residence to the best of your knowledge?
- A. To my knowledge Mr. Waddey never relocated to any other locations that I was aware of. During the month of March and April, I conducted two (indiscernible) home contacts with Mr. Waddey at his residence, wherein I drove to his residence, parked across the street and made phone contact with him. He came to the window, waved to me, and I verified his location there and we talked for a while.
- Q. I want to talk more about that. How has precautions related to the COVID-19 pandemic impacted your ability to continue close supervision of an individual like Mr. Waddey?
- A. I think it's significantly impacted the ability to safely and closely conduct supervision activities. While a lot of supervision nowadays, thanks to technology, does consist of phone calls and emails and other forms of reporting, the probation office still conducts home contact.

During the course of a normal home contact, the probation officer will walk into an

individual's residence, walk around the residence with that individual and do what's called a plain view search or plain view observation, meaning that the probation office looks to see if (indiscernible) in the home. If there are any objects that appear to constitute contraband or violations of supervised release conditions, the officer is obligated to seize these items. These home contacts also allow the probation officer to generally assess how someone appears to be doing, how well they're doing at home, how well they appear to be holding up with basic living necessity, things of that nature.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted probation operations in that it is not safe for probation officers at this time to go into the residences of people under supervision. The reason for that is that the average probation officer at any given day conducting field activities may go into the homes of anywhere between half a dozen to a dozen different individuals.

And in my case, having the caseload that I do, those individuals would reside likely not only all over Nashville, Metropolitan Nashville, but potentially in various counties across Middle

Tennessee. So I could be exposing myself to the

residences of between half a dozen or a dozen different individuals a day.

2.0

2.1

2.4

And when I go into other individuals' home, if I have exposed myself to anything during my prior stops, by entering the next individual's home, I'm potentially exposing them to everything I've been exposed to.

So for those reasons, since only about a week after the federal warrant for Mr. Waddey's arrest was issued, I've not been able to go into his home or the home of anyone that I supervise. Therefore, that prevents me from being able to see with my own eyes what's going on in the residence. It also prevents me from being able to do that (indiscernible) in an effective manner which (indiscernible). We don't always announce we're coming.

We may just knock on someone's door or we may call a mere matter of minutes before we arrive or if someone doesn't answer the door, we may call from at the door. In case of the COVID-19 pandemic, and particularly in Mr. Waddey's case, when I arrived at his residence, I would always call so as not to exacerbate what appeared to be his previously stated concerns about individuals coming to his house or potentially trying to make entry.

Q. And from these conversations and the modifications you made to your supervision, to your knowledge, was Mr. Waddey aware of the more limited way in which you were conducting supervision of him?

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

A. Mr. Waddey was aware. As the probation office has made certain changes to supervision, we've not necessarily sent out a list or any kind of formal notice to every individual under supervision to any modifications we're making. Most individuals under supervised release are learning about these modifications as they go along.

For example, when I make a visit to someone and say it's the first time I've visited them since I've no longer been able to go by their house, I'll call from outside and explain what's going on.

In Mr. Waddey's case, the discussion about modification of supervision activity became one of the focal points of our conversations on the phone after or around March 15. Mr. Waddey repeatedly asked me questions along the lines of whether or not the probation office was essentially ceasing activities because the government was falling apart.

Many times Mr. Waddey called me, asked me if I knew anything. He stated on multiple occasions that he believed that I, as a representative of the

federal government, would have some deeper insight into what was going on with regard to the general pandemic and what was coming. In those conversations Mr. Waddey indicated that what he believed was coming was essentially riots in the streets or a federally ordered quarantine. So, again, he repeatedly asked me questions about that.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

The most humane and I felt helpful response that I could give Mr. Waddey was to calmly explain to him that I do not represent the entire federal government, that I represent part of the judiciary; and, therefore, I explained to him that we were changing the way that we did some things in order to be try to stay safe and healthy during this pandemic. We weren't ceasing our operation.

And I emphasized to him during every one of those conversations (indiscernible) modification, the way the probation (indiscernible) his job, he remained subject to every single one of his supervised release conditions and had to follow all of them equally.

Q. Based on these conversations, was
Mr. Waddey aware that you had, you know, for at least
some period that you were discontinuing conducting
home visits in which you would actually go inside his

home?

2.0

2.1

2.4

- A. Yes. Mr. Waddey would have been aware of that since at least mid March.
- Q. Are you familiar with the United States
  Marshals Service report regarding items that were
  located in Mr. Waddey's residence when they attempted
  to serve the arrest warrant on him?
  - A. Yes, I am.
  - Q. Have you reviewed that report?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Are any of the items that were identified or seen while in Mr. Waddey's home items that you would have considered either contraband or subject to confiscation if you had been able to conduct (indiscernible) inspection?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Are there any of the specific items that you would identify as items that you would have confiscated?
- A. Yes. According to the report, on Mr. Waddey's coffee table was located a water bong pipe. I'm familiar generally with what those look like and I would have viewed that as drug paraphernalia. Also on the report in the bedroom there were cans of police chemical spray, gas

grenades, which I believe was described as the brand SABRE RED. Also Mr. Waddey was in possession of airsoft pistols. And while airsoft pistols are not necessarily something that might deliver a lethal blow, I have in the past seized those from individuals' homes because they do appear to be identical to handguns.

2.0

2.1

2.4

He also had allegedly on his possession two knives, including what was described as a necklace blade. And I believe that had I become aware of anything like a necklace blade or a blade that appeared to be anything other than something someone would use at a regular workplace, those likely would have been seized as evidence of contraband as well.

- Q. The basis for seizing those items, would that be because they were potential dangerous weapons?
- A. Yes, potential dangerous weapons to another person. In the case of all of those items being together in one place, given the particulars of Mr. Waddey and his supervision, they would certainly cause alarm had I found them in the course of a regular home contact.

MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I don't think I have any further questions for Mr. Foster at this time.

```
1
                   THE COURT: Mr. Farmer, any
 2
     cross-examination?
 3
                   MR. FARMER: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
 4
                         CROSS-EXAMINATION
 5
     BY MR. FARMER:
 6
             Q.
                   Mr. Foster, can you hear me?
 7
             Α.
                   I can.
 8
                   Okay. Do you have your -- your petition
             Ο.
      in front of you?
 9
10
             Α.
                   Yes.
11
                   Do you have the incident report that you
12
     referenced from the police department that I had filed
13
     as an exhibit also in front of you?
14
                   I have the incident report. I did not
             Α.
15
     see which one you filed as the exhibit, but the one I
16
     have says Incident Report at the top, yes.
17
                   THE COURT: Is it the Incident --
18
                   MR. FARMER: Is it a five-page --
19
                   THE COURT: Incident report from March 15
2.0
     of 2020?
2.1
                   THE WITNESS:
                                Yes.
22
                   THE COURT: All right. I think -- I
23
     believe it's --
2.4
                   MR. FARMER: I'm going to ask --
25
                   THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Farmer.
```

BY MR. FARMER:

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. I'm going to ask you about those. First, I just wanted to clarify, have you spoken personally with Mrs. Andrea Stones?
  - A. No, I have not.
- Q. When was the last time you spoke with Mr. Waddey?
- A. I believe that my last conversation with Mr. Waddey was in late April, I believe approximately on the 24th. I believe he left voicemail messages for me early on the morning on which he was arrested, but I don't believe we had telephonic contact that date.
- Q. Okay, all right. Okay. So I want to talk about the violations that you allege in your petition. And I just want to take them in order, okay. So I want to focus first on violation No. 1. Are you with me?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So the narrative that you give here, I'm looking specifically at page 2 of the violation report, this narrative and you say in here it was obtained largely from an incident report prepared by MNPD. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Do you see where you represent that?

- 1 Α. Yes. 2 Okay, all right. And is that the same Q. 3 incident report that you have in your possession? 4 Α. Yes. 5 Okay. And so is it your understanding, Ο. 6 based from the incident report, that the police were 7 called out there that night and didn't make an arrest; 8 is that correct? 9 Α. That they did not make an arrest, is that 10 what you said? 11 Q. Yes. 12 Α. Yes, that's my understanding. 13 And that they spoke with both Mrs. Stones Ο. 14 and Mr. Waddey at the scene; is that correct? 15 Α. Yes. 16 0. And that this was at Mr. Waddey's home; 17 correct? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Ο. your testimony whether you were saying that you 2.0
  - Q. And it was a little unclear to me from your testimony whether you were saying that you believed that Mr. Waddey had been drinking at that time. And so so if you could clarify that for me. Are you saying that you believe Mr. Waddey had been drinking when the police showed up?

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

25

A. No, I don't have evidence of him having

been consuming alcohol when the police arrived, no.
And that was not my reading of the report.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Okay. And that -- and that's not my reading either, but it was a little -- a little fuzzy to me. Okay.
- A. I believe if I can clarify, I believe that I was referencing to the statement made by Ms. Stone to police.
  - Q. Okay. Are you crediting that statement?
- A. I'm stating that she said it. I don't have any other independent evidence to say whether or not it was true.
- Q. Did you ask Mr. Waddey if he had been drinking while -- while he was doing Brazilian jujitsu with Ms. Stone?
- A. No, we did not discuss whether he had been using alcohol prior to arriving at his parents' residence later during the same evening.
- Q. Okay. But it's your understanding that he left while the police were -- were still there?
  - A. I'm not entirely clear on that point.
- Q. Okay. So it's possible he left while the police were still there?
- A. Well, I wrote in my report, which is based on a note that I made, that after -- that before

police departed he left to spend the rest of the evening at his parents' house. So I believe he maybe left while they were still there.

- Q. Okay. Certainly if he was drunk or had used alcohol, you wouldn't expect the police to allow him to drive away, would you?
- A. I couldn't speculate as to that, but I would concede the point you're making.
- Q. Okay. Look at the incident report for me, if you can. And specifically page 4. Tell me when you're there.
  - A. I'm there.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. And I want to -- I want to focus on the paragraph -- and this paragraph didn't make the petition. It looks like the rest of it did, but this specific paragraph did not. The very last paragraph said due to conflicting statements. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. And I'm going to read it and you tell me if I've read it correctly. Due to conflicting statements, lack of physical injuries, and lack of any witnesses, officers were unable to prosecute on the victim's behalf.
  - Did I read that right?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.

1 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with Tennessee law regarding domestic violence incidents? 2 3 Α. Not intimately, no. 4 Are you familiar generally in your role Ο. 5 as a probation officer? 6 Α. I would not dare to speak to my knowledge 7 of the law (indiscernible). 8 Okay. So the fact that Mr. Waddey was Ο. 9 not arrested after the police investigation, does that 10 tell you anything as a probation officer? 11 Α. It would appear to be consistent with the 12 statement made here, that they did not see visible 13 injuries and there were no other witnesses. 14 They didn't take her down -- she Right. 15 didn't request to go down to get a warrant that 16 evening, did she? 17 No, I don't believe so. Α. 18 Ο. Okay. Are you familiar with Tennessee 19 Code Annotated 36-3-619? 2.0 Α. No, I am not. 2.1 Are you familiar with the mandatory Ο. 22 arrest privilege -- or, I'm sorry. Strike that, let 23 me start over. 2.4 Are you familiar with the mandatory

arrest provision in Tennessee law regarding domestic

violence incidents?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- A. No, I'm not.
- Q. Okay. But in any event, you agree with me that on the -- on the night at issue, March 15, the police were called out there, they did an investigation, and they didn't make any arrest; correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. The next day did Mr. Waddey discuss this event with you, is that correct, on March 16?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And then also that day or possibly the next day Mr. Waddey discussed that he'd been served with a temporary order of protection; is that correct?
- A. I believe on the 17th Mr. Waddey stated that he had been informed by representatives of Davidson County Sheriff's Office that there did exist a temporary order of protection, but I don't believe he stated that he was served.
- Q. Okay. Have you seen that temporary order of protection?
  - A. No, I have not.
- Q. Okay. Do you know what a temporary order

of protection is?

2.0

2.1

2.4

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. So I started to ask you to explain it to me, but maybe let me do it this way. You understand that a temporary order of protection is issued ex parte; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. It's issued without the benefit of a hearing; is that right?
- A. It's my understanding that they are issued and then an individual is served and then at a subsequent date a hearing will be set regarding (indiscernible).
- Q. That's right. That's exactly right. But in the meantime the temporary order of protection requires the person, once served, to not have any contact with the alleged victim; is that your understanding?
  - A. That's my understanding.
- Q. Okay. And then looking back at your -- at the petition, you report in here that you also told Mr. Waddey that he's not to have any contact with Ms. Stones as of March 17; is that right?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Okay. To your knowledge has he had any

contact with Ms. Stones? 1 Α. No. 3 Ο. Okay. To your knowledge is the order 4 still in effect? Has there been a hearing as to the 5 merits of the order or not? 6 Not that I'm aware of. 7 Okay. To your knowledge has anyone filed Ο. 8 any allegations or made any claims that Mr. Waddey has 9 violated this petition in any way as it relates to 10 Mrs. Stone? 11 Α. Not that I'm aware of, no. 12 0. Okay. Mr. Suedekum asked you about the 13 arrest warrant alleging domestic assault. Do you see 14 that? 15 Α. Yes. Okay. What date was that sworn out? And 16 0. 17 I'm not trying to trick you. It's March 17 at 9:51 in 18 the morning --19 Α. The 17th, yes. 2.0 Q. -- do you see that at the bottom? 2.1 Α. Yes. 22 Do you see that? Okay, all right. Q. 2.3 right. And that is a good two days after the incident

occurred; is that right?

Yes.

Α.

2.4

1 Q. A day after the police were out there 2 investigating? Or two days after that; is that correct? 3 4 Α. Yes. 5 Okay. You had said -- and I believe you 6 were asked if a state court judge had found probable 7 cause. Do you see who issued this warrant, who signed it? 8 9 I believe (indiscernible). Α. 10 Ο. Do you know who that is? 11 Α. No, I don't know him. 12 0. Do you know if he's a judge or a night 13 court magistrate? 14 Α. I don't know. 15 Q. You don't know that? It says Metropolitan General Sessions. 16 Α. 17 All right. It says slash commissioner; Q. 18 right? 19 Α. Slash commissioner, yes. 2.0 Q. Okay. So it could be a commissioner? 2.1 Yes. And I see that there is, underneath Α. 22 his name stamped partially obscured, judicial 2.3 magistrate. 2.4 Judicial magistrate, okay. Okay. Ο. 25 Let's move on to No. 2. You must refrain from unlawful use of a controlled substance. And this was separate and apart from the violation alleging alcohol use; is that correct?

A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. Okay. So I want to talk about these test positive test dates that you have on here. First of all, how frequently was Mr. Waddey being tested, being drug tested?
- A. Very frequently. At times several times a week.
- Q. Several times a week? Okay. And you've listed all the positives that he had during -- during this time period; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Do any of these -- these tests on these dates at issue, did any of these have to be resubmitted or retested in any way?
- A. I don't believe so. I know that when I asked for an analysis of a number of these, I asked for a comparative analysis, wherein the lab was supposed to tell me whether or not he had used marijuana anew, (indiscernible) certain tests, but I don't believe it was a reanalysis (indiscernible). I believe it was a comparison of THC levels.
  - Q. A comparison of THC levels?

- A. Yes, I believe so.
  - Q. Did you get that back?
  - A. Yes, I did.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. What did it show? While you're looking at that, may I ask some questions at the same time?
- A. I had to get to the right page, I apologize.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. It states that it was the opinion of the writer, Pat Pizzo, Director of Toxicology at Alere Toxicology Services, that Mr. Waddey used marijuana or a product containing THC prior to each of the collections listed. And those that were listed in this report that I received back from Alere were 8-23-19, 8-26-19 and 10-7-19.
  - Q. Okay. And what about the other four?
- A. I didn't request analysis for those, not beyond the analysis of whether or not they contained THC.
- Q. Okay, all right. So a couple questions about this issue, then. So you state in your petition that you've informed Judge Crenshaw of this already; is that right?
- A. I had previously informed Judge Crenshaw of, I believe, the majority of those positive tests.

- Q. And he requested no action so that Mr. Waddey could go to out -- could continue receiving outpatient counseling; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And that was your recommendation as well; is that right?
  - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. Okay. And I think you told us that he's been in outpatient counseling pretty much consistently; correct?
  - A. Yes, he has.
- Q. Okay. So he's in outpatient counseling; is that right?
- A. Up until the time of these arrest, I'm not certain. I believe that when I was speaking with him in March and April he'd indicated it had been some time since his last outpatient counseling, but that point of our conversation was unclear. So I would say that he was, at least until March, still in outpatient counseling.
- Q. Okay. And who -- where was he -- who was he -- where was he receiving outpatient counseling?
- A. I believe that up until a few months before that he'd been seeing Gary Wilson. But he had more recently, in February, told me that he had gone

to another specialist whose name I do not recall. And that he was still continuing to receive medication through Dr. Kyger.

- Q. So Dr. Kyger -- and who is Dr. Kyger?
- A. I believe Dr. Kyger is a psychiatrist who prescribes to him psychiatric medication.
- Q. Okay. And your information is that Dr. Waddey currently has a doctor/patient -- not Dr. Waddey, excuse me, let me start over.

Your information is that Mr. Waddey currently has a doctor/patient relationship with Dr. Kyger; is that correct?

- A. I believe so.
- Q. Okay. So but in any event Mr. Waddey has always denied that he used marijuana; is that right?
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

- Q. During your supervision he's never been arrested with marijuana, has he?
  - A. No.
- Q. You've never found marijuana in his house, have you?
  - A. No.
- 23 Q. On the raid that you discussed earlier 24 on -- on May 7 when the police came in, there was no 25 marijuana there then, was there?

- A. None in the report that I saw, no.
- Q. Okay. Was CBD oil found?
- A. I don't believe that any was listed in the report.
- Q. Okay. Have you looked at any pictures from the -- from the raid?
  - A. No, I have not.
- Q. If I were to tell you or if a witness were to testify that the bong that you referenced was found immediately next to CBD oil, would you have any reason to dispute that?
  - A. No.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Okay. All right. Let's move on to Violation No. 3, the refrain from use of alcohol. And so we've already kind of cleared out whether this alleged assault, whether we think alcohol was a fueling factor of that; correct? We've already talked about that.
  - A. We have discussed that.
- Q. Okay. So and I'm looking at your your allegations here. And you talk about a half point of vodka with a relapse, and this was reported to Judge Crenshaw, and both you and Judge Crenshaw requested no action so that he could continue to do outpatient counseling. And is that similar to the

issue we talked about above with the -- with the THC positive test?

A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. Okay. So the new issue of alcohol is this issue where he told you that and tell me if I've got it wrong. He told you that he'd gotten into an argument with a some sort of scuffle, however you want to describe it, with his girlfriend. He left, went to his parents' house and said he drank alcohol at his parents' house; is that right?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Okay. This outpatient treatment he has been involved in, does that include alcohol treatment as well?
- A. The treatment that he received via his outpatient counselor and psychiatrist, as it was described to me, was intended to address the totality of his issues, which are co-occurring. A co-occurring issue is when someone suffers from an issue with a substance, as well as any other underlying mental health diagnosis.
- Q. Okay. How many times has he been screened for alcohol?
- A. Mr. Waddey was screened for alcohol concurrent to every one of his drug tests.

Q. Okay. Has he ever had a negative -- has he ever had negative screens?

2.0

2.1

2.4

A. If you'll give me a moment to review my notes on that information, please.

According to my notes, he tested positive for alcohol on April 15 of 2019 and he tested positive for alcohol on August 14 of 2019.

- Q. Okay. And so you -- and you discussed the positive of August 14 of 2019 in your petition, but I was asking about negative screens. Am I correct as far as the remaining tests were negative?
- A. Yes. He was tested at a frequency of very often two or three times a week, so if it's not listed here, the tests were negative.
- Q. You don't report the negative ones, you report the positive ones; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Okay. During the May 7 raid of his house, was any alcohol found?
- A. I don't believe any was listed in the report that I got, no.
  - Q. You're not aware of any alcohol being found?
    - A. I'm not aware of any.
    - Q. Okay. How long has Mr. Waddey been on

supervision, not just with you, but all in all? 1 2 Mr. Waddey initiated his supervision term Α. on June 1 of 2018. 3 4 And how long is his supervision? 5 Α. His supervision was a two-year term that, 6 I believe, was originally scheduled to conclude on 7 May 31 of 2020. 8 So then 10 days or 12 days, this Ο. 9 violation notwithstanding, he was due to be finished 10 in less than two weeks; is that fair to say? 11 Α. Yes. 12 0. Okay. These are Grade C violations, is 13 that right, or 5C violations?

- - Α. That's correct.
- Okay. I want to talk a little bit about Q. this concept that Mr. Waddey is, I guess, conspiracy-minded. Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?
- Yes, I am. Α.

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Okay. You're not saying that being conspiracy-minded is illegal, are you?
  - Α. No.
- You're not saying that being conspiracy-minded is a violation of Mr. Waddey's supervision, are you?

1 Α. No. 2 I would say, frankly, that a significant Q. 3 portion of our country right now is fairly conspiracy-minded. Would you agree with that? 4 5 Α. I can see that. 6 Ο. Okay. You also discussed that the 7 COVID-19 makes it more difficult to supervise 8 Mr. Waddey; is that right? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Ο. Is it fair to say that Mr. Waddey is very 11 concerned about contracting this virus? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Okay. You discuss he would ask you Ο. 14 questions about government shutdown and those sorts of 15 Is it fair to say that he was concerned about 16 what the effect of the virus was having on the 17 government? 18 Α. Yes. 19 He talked to you all the time, didn't he? Ο. 2.0 Α. Very regularly. 2.1 He called you almost daily, I think, at Q. 22 some point you said; is that right? 23 Yes. Α. 2.4 Did he view you as a source of 0. 25 information inside the federal government that could

help give him some insight as to what was really happening with this COVID-19 pandemic?

A. No.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- O. You don't think so?
- A. No. As I explained to Mr. Waddey on multiple occasions, my knowledge of what the overall federal government and the state government was doing often came at the same rate of speed that it would for him. I, like I encouraged Mr. Waddey to do and I did myself, would listen to or read about daily federal government briefings and listen to or read about state briefings.

And that was the majority of information that I would receive, as I emphasized to Mr. Waddey.

I did not have any inside line to information, nor was I receiving information at a faster rate of speed.

- Q. And you understand that and I understand that, but Mr. Waddey kept asking you for information; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And so -- and maybe I misunderstood, but, you know, I kind of felt like that the tone of some of these questions about the CO-VID shutdown and the government, you know, not sending probation officers out in the field anymore is that

Mr. Waddey knew nobody was checking up on him so he could do more stuff.

But just to reiterate, there was no alcohol or marijuana found in his home; is that right?

- A. Not as far as I know, no.
- Q. Okay. The items in the home, you talked about this water bong pipe that you've told me that you don't know if it was CBD oil next to it or not; correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And then the -- I think there was chemical spray and airsoft pistols and some knives.

  And I understand you to tell me that you would have confiscated those because of a guy like Mr. Waddey, his history, you would have had concerns about him having that stuff; is that fair?
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Are you saying, though -- you're not saying that the airsoft pistols are illegal, per se, are you?
  - A. No.
- Q. Or the knives, that they're illegal per se, are you?
- A. No. Although, I can -- I've not seen the knives. I couldn't tell you about their legality.

Q. That's fair. And that the police chemical spray, the chemical spray that it's illegal per se, are you?

A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Are these things that are commercially available, to your knowledge?
- A. While several of them sound commercially available, I do remember that there was a notation about the chemical spray that I believe stated police grade or police type. So I'm not sure about the legality of his ownership of that. Again --
- Q. You don't know one way or the other about that?
  - A. No.
- Q. But in any event, Mr. Waddey wasn't charged with any crimes based on what was found in his house, was he?
  - A. No, not that I'm aware of.
- Q. Okay. All right. He talked to you about going to live -- I think he described it as in the middle of a state park. Do you remember that?
- A. Yeah, that was about as far as he would narrow it down, yes.
- Q. Okay. All right. And tell me if I'm wrong, but it sounds like you were describing that

1 more as he wanted to go kind of be in the woods away 2 from everybody, off the grid, didn't want anybody to 3 know where he was. Is that fair enough? 4 Yes, that was my impression. 5 Okay. But I just think it bears honing 0. 6 in on. He asked you if he can do this; is that right? 7 Α. Repeatedly, yes. 8 And you told him no; is that right? Ο. 9 Α. That's correct. 10 And he didn't do it, did he? Ο. 11 Α. No, not as far as I know. 12 MR. FARMER: Okay. All right. Those are 13 my questions. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Foster, this is 15 Judge Holmes. Do you know where Mr. Waddey was living at the time that he was arrested? 16 17 THE WITNESS: Mr. Waddey? 18 THE COURT: Yes. THE WITNESS: I believe he was at his 19 2.0 address of record, which is in the Crieve Hall area of 2.1 Nashville. 22 THE COURT: Was that the residence where 2.3 his girlfriend and his children also live? 2.4 THE WITNESS: Yes, up until, I believe,

March 15, after which the girlfriend took their

children and resided elsewhere.

THE COURT: All right.

All right. Any other questions for Mr. Foster as a result of my questions, either by Mr. Suedekum or Mr. -- Mr. Suedekum, you first. Any other redirect?

MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I do have a few redirect questions.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SUEDEKUM:

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. Mr. Foster, you were asked about
  Mr. Waddey and some of his conspiracy theories. In
  your opinion, what is the significance of those,
  the -- I will use paranoia about certain world events.
  What is your opinion of the significance of that as it
  relates to Mr. Waddey's supervision?
- A. Mr. Waddey's conspiracy beliefs and ideas seem to impact his willingness to trust or take at face value the input of the probation office or even the reasons for some of his supervised release conditions. It also, I believe, intercepted, quite unfortunately, with what our country has experienced, and that it seemed to play into and validate or appear to validate several of his beliefs.

On many occasions he expressed to me that

he did not feel that he could adequately protect himself from circumstances that he firmly believed were coming into being around him, such as the notion that because he himself had stockpiled various resources such as food and other items, that he would have to protect himself and those items from other individuals in the community who would, inevitably, come to take them from him. That, to me, seemed of concern, of significant concern.

2.0

2.1

2.4

On several occasions he told me that he saw what he described as cars full of young people of minority dissent driving around casing homes. And he stated emphatically that he knew what it looked like when someone cased a home and that he would protect himself, if he had to, from anyone who tried to intrude.

He also stated on one occasion that his mother had brought him some food. And in the conversation with me he seemed upset about it, that she'd done so in plain view of anyone in the neighborhood who might have seen it because it was further evidence that he had things that he believed others would want.

He believed that there were food shortages that would occur and were already occurring.

He described sincere belief that society was already collapsing and that it was coming soon. He vaguely described other alleged sources of information and intelligence, as he called it. People — at least one person, allegedly some governmental source or governmental employee that he knew other than me, who was telling him that things would happen very soon and that things were going to get really, really bad.

On several occasions that we spoke or that I sometimes just listened, Mr. Waddey sounded distraught to the point that I believed that based upon the way he was talking and the manner of voice he may have even been intoxicated already.

All of these things create significant concern for me that Mr. Waddey's existing world view, which is well-documented, is coalescing with the world around us, and that potentially he would either not heed my instructions to stay put or that he might misinterpret things around him as being actual danger, that he might have to (indiscernible) or that he might seek to somehow harm himself.

Now, again, I'm not saying that he did any of these things. I'm expressing that these were my concerns, in answer to your question.

Q. You were asked about testing him for

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

using alcohol. To your knowledge, how long does alcohol stay in a person's system normally?

- A. Less than 72 hours. Generally not more than 30 something hours or 48 hours, in my experience.
- Q. So, in contrast to, say, marijuana if someone were to consume alcohol, it would leave their system and leave no traces much more rapidly; is that fair to say?
  - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. Are you familiar with where Mr. Waddey had the special condition that he was not to consume any alcohol while on supervised release?
- A. Yes. He had previously identified issues of abusing alcohol. There were documented occasions where he told treatment providers that admittedly he had some fear issues of alcohol before, and I believe there was an occasion that (indiscernible) sentencing date before Judge Crenshaw where he had apparently consumed alcohol in excess the evening before and was, I believe, deemed to have been intoxicated at the time of that sentencing; therefore, it was forestalled to another date.
- Q. You were asked some questions about whether or not the marshal found any drugs or alcohol anywhere in the residence. To your knowledge, were

1 the marshals conducting a full search of the premises, as if they were conducting a search warrant or were 2 3 they there to locate Mr. Waddey? 4 I believe they were there to locate 5 Mr. Waddey. 6 MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I don't have 7 any further questions for Mr. Foster. But I would, at 8 this time, move to enter the warrant affidavit as 9 Government's Exhibit 1. I don't believe I actually 10 entered that into evidence. 11 THE COURT: All right. Any response, 12 Mr. Farmer, to the government's request to admit the 13 warrant affidavit into evidence? 14 MR. FARMER: No, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. That will be admitted as Government's Exhibit 1. 16 17 (Government Exhibit No. 1 was admitted.) 18 THE COURT: Any recross, Mr. Farmer? 19 MR. FARMER: I do, Your Honor. 2.0 RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. FARMER: 2.1 22 Mr. Foster, following up on -- on 23 Judge Holmes' questions about where Mr. Waddey was 2.4 when he was arrested, your information is that he was

at the house that he'd been living in all this time;

is that right, over in Crieve Hall?

2.0

2.1

2.4

- A. I think I can answer with more specificity. At the moment of Mr. Waddey's arrest he had returned to the residence in Crieve Hall in his vehicle. To answer the (indiscernible) he'd been living, as far as I'm aware, he has been living steadily at the residence in Crieve Hall since —
- Q. So when the marshals showed up -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to talk over you. Go ahead.
- A. It was my understanding that since the events of March 15 he had been residing steadily at that residence and that earlier on the morning of his arrest he had left to go to work and that he returned to that residence after he received notification through his telephone that his doors had been breached, and I believe he saw on the house's external video camera that there were police vehicles there. Therefore, he returned. The marshals had already made entry to the residence, saw him and placed him under arrest.
- Q. Okay. I gotcha. So to be clear, when the marshals showed up to his house, he wasn't there; correct?
  - A. Not initially, yes, that's correct.
  - Q. Not initially. When the marshals showed

1 up, he wasn't there; correct? Α. Correct. 3 Ο. Okay. When they broke the door in, he 4 wasn't there then either; is that right? 5 As far as I know, yes, that's correct. Α. 6 That's the (indiscernible) events. 7 In fact, your information is he was at Ο. 8 work when this occurred; is that right? 9 I know that he wasn't at the residence. 10 And I base him being at work on a voicemail message 11 that he left for me after he received notification 12 through his telephone that there had been what he 13 believed at that time to be a break-in. He had stated 14 that he had been at work. 15 Okay, all right. He came back, saw the Ο. 16 police officers; is that correct? 17 Α. I believe so. Okay. Did he flee? 18 Q. 19 I saw no mention of that in any reports, Α. 2.0 no. 2.1 Okay. Did he fight with the police? Q. 22 No, I saw no record of that. Α. 2.3 These things that you mentioned were Q. 2.4 contraband, some of those things were on his person;

25

correct?

1 Α. That's correct. Did he attempt to use any of these things Q. 3 that you've described as contraband against the police or the marshals? 4 5 Α. No, I saw no record of that 6 (indiscernible). 7 In fact, they said that he -- he arrived 8 at the home and was taken into custody without 9 incident; is that right? 10 Α. Yes. 11 MR. FARMER: Okay. All right. Those are 12 my questions. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 MR. FARMER: Oh. And I quess, 15 Your Honor, before I stop, I would like to move the 16 incident report in as the next numbered exhibit. 17 THE COURT: All right. That will be the 18 defendant's exhibit. Any response to the request to 19 admit that incident report, Mr. Suedekum? 2.0 MR. SUEDEKUM: No, Your Honor. 2.1 THE COURT: All right. That will be the defendant's Exhibit 1. 22 23 (Defense Exhibit No. 1 was admitted.) 2.4 THE COURT: All right. Any other 25 witnesses, Mr. Suedekum?

1 And, Mr. Foster, if you'd go ahead and 2 mute your line, that would be great. Thank you. 3 Any other witnesses, Mr. Suedekum? 4 MR. SUEDEKUM: Yes, Your Honor. Deputy 5 Michael, Deputy Marshal Michael Etheridge. 6 THE COURT: All right. Marshal, if you 7 would raise your right hand for me, please. 8 MICHAEL ETHERIDGE 9 called as a witness, after having been first duly 10 sworn, testified as follows: 11 THE COURT: You can lower your hand, 12 thank you. And if you'd go ahead and state your name, 13 please, and spell your last name for us -- first and 14 last name, please. 15 THE WITNESS: Mike -- Michael Etheridge, 16 E-t-h-e-r-i-d-q-e. 17 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, 18 Mr. Suedekum. 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 2.0 BY MR. SUEDEKUM: 2.1 Afternoon, Deputy Etheridge. Could you 0. 22 just briefly explain how you are connected to this 2.3 proceeding in Mr. Waddey's case? 2.4 Yes. I was assigned the supervised 25 release warrant for this case and was in charge of the arrest attempt on May 4.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.4

- Q. And can you describe what happened on that morning?
- A. Yes. We briefed prior to going to the residence, and I provided information to our Task Force that was provided to me, which included statements that Mr. Waddey had made in the past and other information, including statements that were attributed to him concerning his desire to kill or harm law enforcement. And statements provided by the probation officer that included his delusional beliefs about the government and law enforcement, his increasing paranoia, and other information from the earlier complaint in this case, with statements attributed to Mr. Waddey concerning that the police were lucky they got the drop on him.

So with this information, we briefed prior to the arrest attempt and then proceeded to the house at 602 Dunston Drive.

- Q. What happened when you got to the residence?
- A. We knocked and announced, identified ourselves as marshals with an arrest warrant. We did that for several attempts and received no response, so we breached the door and entered to search for

Mr. Waddey.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. Did you clear the home to see if there were any individuals present?
- A. We did. With -- based on the arrest warrant for Mr. Waddey, we searched the residence for any place that he could hide.
- Q. Approximately what time in the morning was this?
- A. It was after 7:00. I don't know the approximate time, but it was between, I guess, 7:30 and 8:00.
- Q. When you made your initial sweep, did you find any people present in the home?
  - A. We didn't, no.
- Q. As you were searching for Mr. Waddey, you said you were looking anywhere that he might be. Is it fair to say that when you're serving this type of arrest warrant, you do not conduct a thorough search like you would if you were performing (indiscernible)?
- A. That's correct. We would search places like a bedroom closet, but we wouldn't search a shoebox in that bedroom closet.
- Q. When you were searching the residence for Mr. Waddey, were you there to try and find evidence of alcohol or marijuana?

A. We were not. We were not there in a capacity of a search for evidence. We were there in a capacity to arrest Mr. Waddey.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. During your effort to locate Mr. Waddey inside the residence, did you come across any items or weapons of which you took note?
- A. I did. When we upon entering, when we entered the living room area and initially scanned the room, I did note the water bong on the coffee, living room table. When we were searching under mattresses, we noticed the airsoft pistols. In cabinets were knives, and there were there was a holster like for a pistol on the in the living room on the couch. There were things of that nature. And in one of the bedrooms there were I'm sorry, go ahead.
- Q. You mentioned that there was a holster. To be clear, did you find any actual firearm in the residence?
  - A. No, we didn't.
  - Q. Did you find any --
- A. In one of the rooms there -- no ammunition, but in one of the rooms we did find the pepper spray canisters that were a gas grenade aerosol-type spray, and a gas mask on one of the dressers and a battering ram, a breaching tool used

for entering residence, much like we used in that same room.

- Q. Starting with the airsoft pistol, you mentioned that you found those under a mattress. How many were there?
  - A. There were two that we found.
- Q. In attempting to locate Mr. Waddey, why would you look under the mattress?
- A. We've had instances where people hollow out box springs and lay under the mattress in the box springs.
- Q. Could you briefly just describe what an airsoft pistol is. It's not an actual firearm; is that correct?
- A. Correct, it's -- I would say more similar to a BB pistol or something of that nature. I don't own any, I'm not extremely familiar with them.
- Q. These particular airsoft pistols, did they resemble an actual firearm?
- A. Yes, it was -- we had to look at it twice to determine that it wasn't an actual firearm.
- Q. Although it's not an actual firearm, is it an item that could potentially be used to inflict injury on somebody by shooting them with pellets?
  - A. Possibly.

2.0

2.1

2.4

Q. To your knowledge, would that type of device be allowed in a place like a federal facility or courthouse?

A. No, it would not.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. Mr. Waddey -- I'm not suggesting that Mr. Waddey attempted to bring it to the federal facility, but my point is, would you consider it a potentially dangerous weapon?
- A. Correct, it could absolutely be confused with a real firearm.
- Q. Could you please explain more about the tear gas canister or gas grenade that you said you located. Can you describe what it was?
- A. From what I -- from what I saw, it was a SABRE RED brand, and it was a tear gas canister. I believe that there's a tab on the top that you pop off and then it emits the contents into the air.
- Q. You also mentioned that you located a door breaching tool. Is that unusual to find?
- A. Yes, it is. I don't believe in 17 years I've come across one of those in a house before.
- Q. When you were looking for Mr. Waddey, did you seize all of these items?
  - A. No, we didn't.
  - Q. Why not?

- A. When we were done conducting the search for Mr. Waddey, we were notified that he had pulled up outside. And we left those items in place and notified my supervisor and probation that the items were observed in the home.
- Q. You mentioned that you received a report that Mr. Waddey had been located. Can you explain where and how Mr. Waddey was seen?
- A. Yes. He pulled up outside the residence, and one of the task force officers that were outside interacted with him. And it was reported to me that Mr. Waddey asked if if we were there because of the break—in. And before the conversation could get much farther, they placed him in handcuffs.
- Q. Is your understanding of what happened that when you entered the residence an alarm went off and Mr. Waddey was notified that the alarm of his residence was going off?
  - A. That's correct.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. To your knowledge, was Mr. Waddey taken into custody without any further incident?
- A. Correct. It was described to me that that when he was placed into custody he he complied with the officers outside, had an attitude about it, but did comply.

Q. After he was placed under arrest, were any additional items — or in the process of arresting him, were any items recovered from Mr. Waddey's person?

2.0

2.1

2.4

- A. Yes. There were two knives, a multi tool, a fire starter and a blade on a lanyard around his neck, as well as a handcuff key hidden in the back of his belt with a small -- small string tied to it to access it.
- Q. With respect to the knives that

  Mr. Waddey was carrying, to your knowledge was it

  illegal for him to have any of those weapons or any of
  those knives?
  - A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. You mentioned that a handcuff key was -- was under his belt. Can you explain what -- how that came to be found?
- A. One of the task force officers, after placing Mr. Waddey in the car, based on statements he's made in the past and the original charges, they asked that question, if he had a handcuff key on him. And it's my understanding that he said that he did and it was on his belt, and they removed his belt and found the key.

MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I don't have

1 any further questions for Deputy Etheridge at this time. 3 THE COURT: All right. 4 Mr. Farmer, any questions? 5 MR. FARMER: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. FARMER: 8 Is it Deputy Etheridge; is that correct? Ο. 9 Α. That's correct. 10 Okay. Deputy Etheridge, was the Ο. 11 probation officer present at the scene when you --12 when you made entry? Mr. Foster? 13 No, he wasn't. He was not. 14 Okay. So I -- so as I understand, you Q. 15 had -- you were there to serve an arrest warrant for a 16 supervised release violation; is that correct? 17 Α. Correct. 18 Did you have knowledge of the domestic 19 assault warrant when you came out there? 2.0 Α. We did, yes. 2.1 Okay. Were you attempting to serve that Ο. 22 warrant as well? 23 That was served simultaneously. Α. 2.4 Okay. Was that served by federal Ο. 25 officials or state officials?

1 Α. We had state officials on scene, and when 2 he was arrested, he was taken to Metro, booked in on the domestic assault so he could --3 4 Ο. Okay. 5 Α. -- take care of that charge before he was 6 turned over to the federal system on a detainer. 7 Okay, I understand. My larger point is Ο. 8 there were Metro or state law enforcement officials on 9 the scene when this -- when this incident occurred? 10 Α. Yes, sir. 11 0. Okay, all right. Did you have a search 12 warrant? 13 No, we had an arrest warrant. Α. 14 Okay. And do you have your report of Q. 15 investigation in front of you? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Okay. And do you see in there where you 18 say that Task Force Officer Jacob Anderson knocked and 19 announced, US Marshals with a felony warrant. Do you 2.0 see that or do you have recollection of that? 2.1 Α. Yes. 22 Q. What was the felony? 23 The supervised release violation. Α. 2.4 Okay. That's what you -- you considered Ο.

that a felony warrant?

- A. I believe that's what we considered it that day, yes, sir. We were under the impression that the domestic assault was a misdemeanor.
- Q. Okay. So while you're out there knocking on the door, you don't see or hear anybody in the residence; is that correct?
  - A. No.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. You didn't have any reason -- you hadn't surveilled Mr. Waddey and watched him go in that morning or anything; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you have -- other than -- other than just the fact that that was his residence, did you have any reason to believe he was in there?
- A. Yes. Based on the information we had, the last reported work for him was August of 2019, as well as he reported that from probation that he was self-isolating at his home.
- Q. Okay. You say you breached the front door. What does breach mean?
- A. We used a heavy ramming object to open the door. You hit the door with an object and it (indiscernible).
  - Q. It's like a battering ram?
  - A. Say again, sir.

- 1 Q. It's like a battering ram? Α. Yes. Yes. 3 Ο. How many police officers were out there 4 that day? 5 If you'll give me a second. Α. 6 Ο. You can estimate, if you'd like. 7 Α. Approximately ten. 8 Okay. Were you aware that Mr. Waddey had Ο. 9 been in somewhat regular contact with his probation 10 officer? 11 Α. I didn't know the regularity of it, no. 12 0. Okay. Have you listened to this entire 13 hearing? 14 Yes, I've been here. Α. 15 Okay. All right. Was there ever a Q. 16 thought that, you know what, why don't we just call 17 this guy up and tell him we've got a warrant and make 18 arrangements to come get him? 19 Α. No, there was not. 2.0 Q. Okay. Why not? 2.1 Based on the history and the statements Α. 22 he made about being paranoid, not trusting the 2.3 government, and the desire to kill law enforcement

But, I mean, wouldn't that have made it

officers, we did not take that approach.

0.

2.4

- more safe than going in there and knocking his door
  in?
  - A. Sometimes the element of surprise is better than walking into an ambush, in my opinion.
  - Q. All right. Let's talk about what was found. You said you saw the water bong on the coffee room table; is that right?
    - A. Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- Q. Did you see any CBD oil or other CBD-type products nearby?
  - A. I did not.
- Q. Okay. You didn't see any marijuana in the residence?
  - A. I didn't -- I didn't see any, no.
  - Q. Okay. All right. All those things that you described that you found in there, am I understanding your testimony is that you left them all in there when you left?
    - A. Yes, we left those in place.
    - Q. You didn't seize them?
- 21 A. No, sir.
- Q. You didn't -- Metro -- or state
  officials, the Metro officials, they didn't seize
  them?
- A. No, they didn't.

1 Q. Okay. Is that because they're not 2 illegal? 3 That's because we're not familiar with Α. 4 probation and their -- their procedure for seizing 5 items. We left them in place and reported them to 6 probation. 7 Okav. I want to talk a little bit about Ο. 8 Mr. Waddey driving up. Just to be clear, when he saw 9 you guys, he didn't take off and run? 10 Α. No. 11 Q. He didn't assault anybody? 12 Α. No. 13 Ο. Nothing like that? 14 Α. It's my understanding he was under 15 the impression we were there because of his alarm, and 16 he was taken by surprise when he was told he had a 17 warrant. 18 Q. Okay. 19 MR. FARMER: Okay. Those are my 2.0 questions. 2.1 THE COURT: Any redirect, Mr. Suedekum? 22 MR. SUEDEKUM: Just very briefly, 23 Your Honor. 2.4

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SUEDEKUM:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q. Deputy Etheridge, you were asked about the decision of whether to contact Mr. Waddey and try and arrange a surrender or whether to simply go and execute the warrant. When you were preparing to execute the warrant, were you aware that Judge Crenshaw had ordered the warrant sealed pending the warrant's execution?
- A. Yes, I believe that was in my paperwork that it was under seal.
- Q. Did that information, along with the information provided by probation, factor into your decision as to how you decided to approach trying to locate Mr. Waddey and take him into custody?
  - A. It does.
- MR. SUEDEKUM: No further questions,
- 18 Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Farmer?
- MR. FARMER: No, ma'am.
- 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Deputy
- 22 Etheridge.
- 23 \*\*\*\*\*WITNESS EXCUSED\*\*\*\*\*
- THE COURT: Is there any need for Deputy
- 25 Etheridge to stay as part of the proceedings. He

```
1
     certainly may, but if no one intends to recall him or
     offer his -- any additional testimony from him, then
     he's also free to exit if he'd like to do so.
 3
 4
                   MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I don't have
 5
     any further questions for him. And unless Mr. Farmer
 6
     would like him to stay, I would ask that he be allowed
     to excuse himself if he would like.
 7
 8
                  MR. FARMER: I'm sorry, I was muted.
                                                         Ι
 9
     don't have any reason for him to stay.
10
                   THE COURT: All right. Deputy Etheridge,
11
     you're welcome to stay if you'd like, but you're also
12
     free to go just like you would be if you were a
13
     witness appearing in the courtroom. So thank you,
14
     sir.
15
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Thank you.
16
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
17
                                 Thank you, Your Honor.
                   THE WITNESS:
18
                   THE COURT: All right. Any other
19
     witnesses, Mr. Suedekum?
                                 No, Your Honor.
2.0
                   MR. SUEDEKUM:
2.1
                   THE COURT: All right. Any witnesses,
22
     Mr. Farmer?
                  Did we lose Mr. Farmer?
23
                   MR. SUEDEKUM: He may be on mute.
2.4
                   THE COURT: Mr. Farmer, are you muted
25
     still?
```

```
1
                  MR. FARMER: I did mute, I'm sorry.
 2
                   THE COURT: That's all right. No, I
 3
     asked you to do that, so I appreciate that.
 4
                  MR. FARMER: I would call Gary Waddey. I
 5
     hope he's there.
 6
                   THE COURT:
                               There's been -- I'm supposing
 7
     that was Mr. Waddey. Are you Gary Waddey, sir?
 8
                   THE WITNESS: Yes.
 9
                   THE COURT: All right. So let me go
10
     ahead and swear him in, Mr. Farmer.
11
                  Mr. Waddey, if you'd raise your right
12
     hand, please.
13
                           GARY WADDEY
14
     called as a witness, after having been first duly
15
     sworn, testified as follows:
16
                   THE COURT: All right. You can go ahead
17
     and lower your hand, sir. And then if you would state
18
     your name for us and spell your first and last name,
19
     please.
2.0
                   THE WITNESS: Yes. Gary Waddey, G-a-r-y,
2.1
     W-a-d-d-e-y.
22
                   THE COURT: All right. Go ahead,
2.3
     Mr. Farmer.
2.4
25
```

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. FARMER:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- Q. Mr. Waddey, you've already stated your name. What is your relationship with -- with the defendant, Robert Waddey?
  - A. Yeah, I'm his father.
  - Q. Okay. And how old is Robert?
  - A. He is 25.
- Q. Okay. And what do you do for a living, Mr. Waddey?
- A. I'm retired. I was a compliance officer, a compliance principal for Northwestern Mutual and Northwestern Mutual Investment Services. And now I am an author, I've written a Civil War book that's been published by Mercer University. And I do smaller historical writings for Williamson County and Hickman County.
  - Q. Okay. Do you own property in the Middle District of Tennessee?
    - A. I do.
- Q. Okay. Does Robert own property, your son
  Robert, own property in the Middle District of
  Tennessee?
- A. He does.
- Q. Okay. So you've heard talk about this

house he had over at Crieve Hall that was -- that was 1 2 raided. Have you been on the line throughout this 3 hearing, Mr. Waddey? 4 Yes, I have. Α. 5 Okav. So the house that was raided over 0. 6 on Crieve Hall, are you familiar with that house? 7 I am familiar with it. Α. 8 Ο. Who owns that house? 9 Α. The house is owned by Robert, as well as 10 my wife and myself. 11 Q. Okay. So it's a family home that Robert 12 has ownership in? 13 That is correct. Α. 14 Q. And how close is that to your primary 15 residence? 16 Α. Probably about a mile to two miles. Just 17 across I65. 18 Okay. All right. Who currently lives at 0. 19 the residence that -- at Robert -- I'm going to call 2.0 it Robert's residence, the residence over on 2.1 Crieve Hall. Who currently lives there? 22 Α. Right now just Robert. 2.3 Okay. So once Andrea moved out on the

knowledge; is that right?

night of the incident, she hasn't been back, to your

2.4

A. That is correct.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

25

- Q. Okay. And Robert lives there alone?
  - A. That is correct.
  - Q. Okay. Is Robert employed?
- A. Yes, he is.
  - Q. Okay. What does he do?
- A. He is a -- he works for E3, and I think he's sort of a -- an assistant to one of the owners. He sort of visits multiple job sites, does what they need him to do. And so he's not always -- sometimes he has a crew, sometimes he does labor, but most of the time he's sort of supervising different sites.
- Q. Okay. And is his boss's name Fred Thomas; is that right?
  - A. It is.
- Q. Okay. Did Mr. Thomas send you an email this morning dated May 19 at 9:05 regarding your son Robert?
- A. Yes, he did.
- Q. Okay.

MR. FARMER: And, Your Honor, this email
I provided to the Court prior and the US Attorney's
Office. It is from Fred Thomas regarding Mr. Waddey's
employment at E3 Construction Services. I'd like to
make that the next exhibit, please.

1 THE COURT: Any response, Mr. Suedekum? MR. SUEDEKUM: No, Your Honor. All right. This will be 3 THE COURT: 4 Defendant's Exhibit 2, the email from Mr. Thomas. 5 (Defense Exhibit No. 2 was admitted.) 6 BY MR. FARMER: 7 0. Okay. So let me ask you this, 8 Mr. Waddey. Since the COVID-19 onset, has your son 9 largely stayed at the house when he wasn't working? 10 Α. Yes, he has. 11 0. Okay. He hasn't been out wondering 12 around. He's very concerned about this virus; is that 13 fair to say? 14 Right. He's jogged some. I think he's, Α. 15 you know, been out with his dog some, but pretty much 16 he's stayed at home. 17 Okay. All right. Now, you are aware of 18 the assault charge that was alleged on March 15 at 19 your son's house; is that right? 2.0 Α. That is correct. 2.1 Okay. And you're aware that your son 0. left and came to your house; is that correct? 22 23 That's correct. Α. 2.4 Now, I understand you weren't there that 25 night; right?

1 Α. That's right. My wife and I were at our 2 farm. 3 Q. Okay. So if he was drinking that night, 4 you couldn't say one way or the other about that? 5 Α. That's -- that's right. 6 Q. Okay. All right. He has access to your 7 home. He's your son; is that right? 8 Α. That's right. 9 0. Okay. Are you aware of a temporary 10 restraining -- temporary order of protection issued by 11 Ms. Stone -- Ms. Stones against your son? 12 Α. I was. 13 Okay. To your knowledge has Robert Ο. 14 contacted Ms. Stones in any way since the evening of 15 the alleged assault? 16 Α. Yes. Not at all. 17 Ο. Hasn't called her? 18 Α. No. 19 Hasn't e-mailed her, hasn't sent her text Ο. 2.0 message, smoke signals, nothing at all? 2.1 Α. No. That's correct. 22 Q. Okay. You've had contact with 2.3 Ms. Stones; is that correct? 2.4 Α. T have. 25 Okay. And that was to exchange personal 0.

items and those sorts of things?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- A. That's right.
- Q. Okay. So from March 15 when the police showed up that evening and investigated these allegations to, I guess, May 7 -- and that's, I guess, a seven-week period until your son was taken into custody, he's basically been out working during the day and staying home at night; is that right?
  - A. That's -- that's right.
- Q. And then he's been in complete compliance with the order of protection, to your knowledge; is that right?
  - A. Absolutely.
- Q. Okay. So did you -- were you able to go and look at the house after the raid occurred?
- A. Yes. We were notified as well of the alarm.
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. And so we after talking to Robert and the alarm company told us there were several breaches, I guess where other doors were opened, we came back to Nashville, both my wife and I.
  - Q. Did you take any -- did you take any pictures of the inside of the house?
    - A. Yes. My wife did. And I took a few as

well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

25

- Q. Okay. Did you notice a picture -- did you notice and take a picture of a water bong?
  - A. I did.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. I believe my wife did. Let me correct that, my wife did.
- Q. Okay. But you've seen that picture; is that right?
  - A. Yes, right. That's right.
- Q. And that -- and that picture represents what you saw that -- that day when you looked at the house; is that right?
  - A. That is correct. Just shortly after.
- Q. Okay. And does the water bong, the picture of it, does it show CBD oils and other CBD substances kind of sitting on the table next to the water bong?
  - A. It does.
- Q. Okay.

MR. FARMER: And, Your Honor, I didn't provide this earlier. I had sent while we were talking, sent an email of this photo to the Court's assistant and to Mr. Suedekum. This is a picture that reflects as much that Mr. Waddey's referring to that

```
1
     I'd like to enter as the next exhibit.
                   THE COURT: Well, I will have to take a
 2
 3
     break to look at it myself. But any response,
     Mr. Suedekum?
 4
 5
                   MR. SUEDEKUM: No, Your Honor, I don't
 6
     have any objection to it.
 7
                   THE COURT: All right. That will be
     Defendant's Exhibit 3.
 8
 9
                   (Defense Exhibit No. 3 was admitted.)
10
                   THE COURT: And at some point I'll take a
11
     break --
12
                   MR. FARMER: Are you aware that -- I'm
13
     sorry.
14
                   THE COURT:
                               That's all right. Go ahead.
15
     Go ahead, Mr. Farmer.
     BY MR. FARMER:
16
17
                   Are you aware -- Mr. Waddey, are you
             Q.
18
     aware that your son would use CBD oil?
19
                   I am. Or I have been, yes.
             Α.
2.0
             Q.
                   Why would he do that?
2.1
                   Well, again, he felt like it was calming,
             Α.
22
     and certainly I -- to him as far as anxiety.
                                                     And we
2.3
     certainly felt that way as well.
2.4
                   Okay. All right. To your knowledge, did
             Ο.
25
     he always purchase these substances legally?
```

1 Α. Yes. I mean, it's (indiscernible). 2 It's a legal product; correct? Q. 3 Α. Yes. As far as I know it is, yes. 4 Okay. Right, me too. Okay. Q. 5 So let me -- you're familiar with the term third-party custodian; is that correct? 6 7 Α. Yes. 8 So when your son was first arrested on Ο. 9 the underlying charges before he was -- before he pled 10 guilty, did you serve as a custodian in some capacity 11 for your son? I did. Both my wife and I did. 12 Α. 13 Okay. All right. And what did that Ο. 14 entail? 15 It entailed a daily supervision of Α. 16 Robert. In the -- we laid eyes on him each day. And 17 sometimes that would be brief, but most of the time it 18 would be for a visit or a 30-minute, an hour, just however long that took. 19 2.0 Q. Okay. And that was satisfactory to the 2.1 Court at that time; is that right? 22 It seemed to be. We were asked to do it Α. 2.3 a second time.

concept of you and your wife serving as third-party

Okay. You and I have discussed the

2.4

25

Ο.

custodians again for this matter; is that correct?

A. Yes, that's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- Q. And to be clear, while your previous duties -- you know, as I understand, Robert stayed alone in his home and you kind of checked in on him daily. You're willing to go a step further, if necessary; is that correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. And you're willing to have your son kind of stay in your presence while he's not working or out doing, I guess, essential errands-type things, be it going to the store, the doctor or whatnot; is that correct?
  - A. That's -- that's correct.
- Q. And you and your wife, you or your wife, I guess, are willing to spend the night at whatever residence that he that he resides in; is that correct?
- A. That's -- that's correct.
- Q. Okay.
- 21 MR. FARMER: Okay. Those are my 22 questions, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Any questions, any cross-examination, Mr. Suedekum?
- MR. SUEDEKUM: Yes, Your Honor, I did

1 have a few.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SUEDEKUM:

- Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Waddey. When you previously served as a third-party custodian for your son, that was before all the incidents that have occurred in the alleged violations and petitions that have been submitted while he was on supervised release; is that right?
- A. That -- that's correct. I believe that's correct.
- Q. This was back during the initial criminal case and before his sentencing; is that right?
  - A. That's -- that's correct.
- Q. And you may have heard us discuss it briefly earlier, but do you recall that at the time of -- your son, also Mr. Waddey, at the time of his initial sentencing, Mr. Waddey showed up intoxicated to court that day. Do you recall that?
  - A. I do recall that.
- Q. And his supervised release was revoked; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And he was taken into custody at that point?

A. That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Do you have a copy of the picture from -from Mr. Waddey's residence in front of you?
  - A. I do not.
- Q. Okay. Did you say that you were present when that photo was taken or that your wife went and took that photo?
- A. My wife was there first, so she took that photo, along with hundreds of others.
- Q. Okay. Did you conduct -- what was the purpose of taking the photos of the house? Were you just documenting the appearance of the residence or what was the purpose of that?
- A. Sure. I was -- I was documenting the enormous amount of damage that was done to the house.
  - O. (indiscernible)?
  - A. I lost your voice there.
- Q. Sorry. The types of damage you're referring to such as the front door was breached; is that correct?
- A. That's correct. A door downstairs was torn off as well. The control panel to the garage door was ripped off the wall, and there were other other other other damaged items.
  - Q. Okay. While your son's been on

supervised release, how often would you say that you interact with him?

- A. Well, fairly often. Again, maybe not as much here during the CO-VID issue, but certainly several times a week previous to that.
- Q. Would that include in-person and over the phone or what do you -- what type of interaction would you have?
- A. Yes, over the phone it would be much more frequent. And during the CO-VID time period.
- Q. I see that you've been here. Have you been able to hear the other witness testimony during the course of this hearing? I know this is an unusual way to do it.
  - A. I have, yes.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. Did you hear testimony and are you aware that there are reports that your son has continued to use alcohol while on supervised release, despite the fact that he's prohibited from doing that?
- A. I have certainly been aware of his -- of his use of alcohol a time or two, yes.
- Q. Apart from hearing about it today in court, were you already aware of the fact that your son had continued to use alcohol on supervised release?

- A. Well, again, I just said I was aware he had used. You know, I also am aware of things that he's done to try to mitigate that as well.
- Q. I may have not asked a very good question. I guess before today were you aware that your son had been using alcohol while he's been on supervised release?
- A. I -- I certainly have been aware of that, yes.
- Q. At any point did you talk to your son or try to get him to stop consuming alcohol since it was a condition of his supervised release that he not use it?
  - A. Absolutely.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. Is it fair to say you have not been completely successful in convincing him to stop?
- A. Well, yes and no. I think that there —
  I think right during this time of all times with the
  CO-VID, he has not used alcohol. I think the marriage
  situation or not the marriage, but certainly the
  living situation has brought on stress and some of the
  alcohol use.
- Q. When you searched the house and you were documenting it by taking photographs, did you find any alcohol in the home?

1 Α. We did not. MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I'm attempting 3 to kind of look at the photograph as we proceed here 4 with the hearing. I know that the Court also wants to 5 have an opportunity to look at the photograph --6 THE COURT: Ms. Cox --7 MR. SUEDEKUM: I don't think I have any 8 questions for --9 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Cox has 10 brought the photograph in to me, so I do have it here. 11 But I do have a few questions for Mr. Waddey. 12 Mr. Waddey, if you -- if I should release 13 your son pending his revocation hearing, I want to 14 just be sure I understand your testimony. You're 15 agreeable to him coming to live with you and your wife? 16 17 Yes, if that's necessary. THE WITNESS: 18 I think we would prefer to stay in his home for the 19 reason that, well, we have two large male dogs that do 2.0 not like each other. So it would be better for 2.1 everyone to be separated. And plus we would be at his 22 home, we would be in his home in the guest room. Your Honor, this is 2.3 MR. FARMER:

Jonathan. If I can comment. I think to clarify what he's saying is that the senior Waddeys have a dog, and

2.4

the younger Waddey, Robert, has a dog that don't get along. So for the younger Robert to move in full-time with the senior Waddeys would create conflict there.

2.0

2.1

2.4

So I think what they're proposing -- I guess, first and foremost, if that's the answer, then that's what they'll do and they'll figure it out, but what the proposal is that one or the other of the senior Waddeys will be with Mr. Waddey, with the younger Waddey at his home. Do you follow?

THE COURT: Yes, I do. Thank you.

MR. FARMER: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. And you understand, Mr. Waddey, that if I put -- place your son in your third-party custody, that if you become aware that he's violating any conditions of release, either his supervised release or any conditions I impose, that you're required to report that to the Court, to the probation officer?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. In fact, as an old compliance officer, I would like sort of a listing, if you have it, of what the requirements or rules are so that we could refer to that in any instance.

THE COURT: And you understand if you do report your son, that there's a possibility, then,

```
1
     that he could be remitted back to custody until his
 2
     revocation hearing if he doesn't follow the conditions
 3
     of release pending his revocation hearing. Do you
     understand that?
 4
 5
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 I certainly do.
 6
                   THE COURT: And you're still willing to
 7
     report him if he fails to comply?
 8
                   THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. Remember,
 9
     I was a compliance officer.
10
                   THE COURT: And you understand if you
11
     don't report him, that then you could potentially, or
     your wife, if I should decide to name her a
12
13
     third-party custodian, that the two of you could be
14
     subject to contempt of court proceedings. Do you
15
     understand that?
16
                   THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor.
17
                   THE COURT: All right.
18
                   Any other questions for Mr. Waddey,
19
     Mr. Farmer?
2.0
                   MR. FARMER: No, Your Honor.
2.1
                   THE COURT: Any other questions,
22
     Mr. Suedekum?
23
                   MR. SUEDEKUM: No, Your Honor.
2.4
                   THE COURT: All right.
25
                    *****WITNESS EXCUSED****
```

1 THE COURT: Any other witnesses, 2 Mr. Farmer, or proof? MR. FARMER: No, Your Honor. 3 4 THE COURT: All right. Counsel --5 MR. FARMER: If I didn't make the email 6 an exhibit -- I think I did, but if I didn't, I need 7 to do that. 8 THE COURT: You did. That was 9 Defendant's Exhibit 2. 10 MR. FARMER: Okay. 11 THE COURT: So Counsel wish to be heard, 12 then? Go ahead, Mr. Suedekum. I'll hear from you 13 first. 14 MR. SUEDEKUM: Yes, Your Honor. Well, 15 with respect to the preliminary hearing, the evidence 16 has established probable cause to believe that 17 Mr. Waddey has violated each of the three alleged 18 petitions -- or conditions set forth in the petition, 19 the first being (indiscernible) in violation of 2.0 Tennessee law. The evidence that we have in the record 2.1 22 includes not only the statements that the victim, 23 Mr. Waddey's girlfriend or ex-girlfriend, Ms. Stones, 2.4 she made the night of the incident, that at some point 25 they appeared to have just been wrestling, the

defendant had been drinking and that they were practicing MMA moves on each other.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

But at some point later on Mr. Waddey continued to pursue her and come after her, even after she told him stop and that she didn't want to do it anymore.

In doing so, Mr. Waddey, according to the report, not only pinned her down and put his knees on top of her, but at some point when she tried to protect herself and pull away, got kicked in the chin. And I will concede the report is ambiguous as to whether she was kicked intentionally or whether it was just an accident as a result of the conduct he was engaging in.

But even if it was not an intentional kick, Your Honor, it was certainly reckless. And under Tennessee law, an assault is defined in Tennessee Code 39-13-101(a)(1) as a person commits assault who intentionally, knowingly or recklessly causes bodily injury to another.

I would submit that the facts as they occurred that the (indiscernible) someone is asking you and telling you to stop and then being kicked in the face and having an injured and sore jaw for two days later is sufficient to satisfy the first prong.

I would also further submit, Your Honor, that both of the other two prongs of how assault can be committed are also satisfied by the defendant's behavior here. And I will note that two days later, when Ms. Stones took out the assault affidavit, she swore under oath, recounts the same facts that she had asked Mr. Waddey to stop and that he continued after her. And that his conduct constituted an assault; certainly, at a minimum, probable cause to believe that an assault occurred, both as was found by the magistrate judge, as it was found by Judge Crenshaw when he approved of the revocation.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

With respect to the second and third alleged violations, I think the record is sort of unrefuted that Mr. Waddey had THC in his system. And I understand Mr. Waddey to have told probation that he did this by taking legally purchased and over-the-counter-type substances. But as the probation officer explained, based on his investigation, using hemp or CBD oil would not have caused him to test positive for THC.

In any event, Mr. Waddey was warned that whatever the substance was that he was using, whether it was legally bought, whether it was CBD oil or something else, that it was causing him to test

positive for THC. He continued to use the substance, at least for a time, as he continued to have positive tests for over a span of several months.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

And third, with respect to consuming alcohol, Your Honor, that was not always a standard condition. The typical standard condition is not to consume alcohol to excess. In this particular case, Mr. Waddey's conditions of supervised release are not to consume alcohol at all.

THE COURT: Mr. Suedekum, do you know, were the -- and because I'm not able to access my computer in my courtroom for some reason, but -- and I didn't realize this issue of alcohol use -- I didn't make the connection between the pretrial release conditions -- actually, I didn't know anything about Mr. Waddey's condition when he first appeared for his sentencing hearing. Was there any condition of his pretrial release with respect to the use of alcohol?

MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, Mr. Foster can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the pretrial conditions require persons on release not to engage in the excessive use of alcohol.

THE COURT: Well, that's not -- that's not always a condition of pretrial release. I'll take a break and I'll look at the conditions of pretrial

release. Go ahead, Mr. Suedekum.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, I do have the docket open on my computer, so I'm happy to look at that perhaps while Mr. Farmer is talking and see if I can provide the Court an answer. But from looking at the docket, I do know that Judge Crenshaw did revoke Mr. Waddey's pretrial supervision as a result of him being intoxicated at the initial sentencing hearing. I'll have to pull up the docket to see whether Judge Crenshaw explained in that order the full basis of it, but I do believe that it did constitute a violation of his pretrial supervised release.

THE COURT: All right. I'll take a look at that. Go ahead, Mr. Suedekum.

MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, and then finally with respect to the third condition, consuming alcohol, it may be up for dispute as to how many times and how frequently Mr. Waddey consumed alcohol, but I think the record is clear and everyone is — all witnesses have told the same story that at least at some point on the evening of March 15 he consumed alcohol, in addition to having previous other positive tests for consuming alcohol. And so I would submit, Your Honor, that's sufficient to establish probable cause for that violation.

1 THE COURT: All right. And as to 2 detention? 3 MR. SUEDEKUM: Your Honor, so that I 4 don't repeat my argument, I'll reserve responding to 5 Mr. Farmer's argument about the detention factors if 6 the Court would permit me to do that. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 Go ahead, Mr. Farmer. 9 MR. FARMER: Okay. Thank you, 10 Your Honor. First, as to the probable cause piece of 11 it, starting with just the violations in order, the 12 first violation is says do not violate any law. And 13 the allegation is is that Mr. Waddey has violated 14 state law by committing an assault. 15 It's just a very weak, weak presentation 16 for an assault claim, Your Honor. What we have, 17 what's undisputed before us is that on March 15, 18 Ms. Stones told the police that they were doing some 19 sort of Brazilian jujitsu and she felt like she wanted 2.0 to stop, so Mr. Waddey got rough with her. 2.1 The police went out there, they investigated that situation, and -- and they didn't 22 23 find enough to arrest Mr. Waddey. And that's very 2.4 significant in Tennessee domestic violence cases,

Your Honor. And I asked the probation officer about

that. That's a Tennessee Code Section 36-3-619. It requires police officers -- and require is strong. It's kind of phrased mandatory arrest provision.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

But what the text says is that if a police officer finds probable cause that a domestic injury has — has occurred, the preferred response is arrest. I can tell Your Honor that that's interpreted by Metro police officers is that if they find a scratch, a bruise, a cut or credible evidence of an assault, then they're arresting somebody and they'll let the courts sort it out. So the fact that no arrest was made that night is — is very, very probative.

Additionally, Ms. Stones indicated that — that Mr. Waddey was intoxicated that evening when the fight occurred. She says that in the incident report for the police officers. I think we know that's clearly not true because the police officers let Mr. Waddey drive away. And I don't think it requires great powers of deduction to conclude if, one, Mr. Waddey was drunk that, A, they would have been more likely to arrest him; and, B, they certainly wouldn't have let him drive away.

So, you know, you've got police officers, the first people on the scene whose job and training

is to evaluate probable cause. And they said, you know what, we don't think there is probable cause. So nothing happened vis-à-vis the arrest warrant until two days later when Ms. Stones goes down on her own and gets a night court magistrate to agree to give her a warrant. Short of that, there's been no finding of probable cause from anyone, and I think this Court should refrain from finding probable cause as to the assault.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Moving on to the second violation, the THC, the testimony I heard was that he has always and repeatedly and constantly tested, and he's got six positive tests that he regularly insists are not related to marijuana abuse, but rather from CBD oil. We don't have any marijuana. Mr. Waddey, the father, testified that the son uses CBD. We've got pictures showing CBD oil at the house.

So I just don't think he's used marijuana. I don't think he's used controlled substances. And this has been reviewed by Judge Crenshaw anyway.

The alcohol, you know, I'll stipulate that he's had positive alcohol tests per the petition, at least that's what the record shows. I will say that -- that Judge Crenshaw has already analyzed this,

at least as to the first ones. I don't really have any further argument as to his admission of drinking alcohol. You know, other than to say that no alcohol has or ever has been found been on Mr. Waddey.

Would you like me to go ahead and transition into detention?

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MR. FARMER: Okay. All right. So,

Your Honor — as Your Honor knows for detention, I've

got to show by clear and convincing evidence two

things, based on the record, first that he's not a

flight; and second, that he's not a danger.

So starting with flight — let me find my notes. What we know about from the record about flight is that Mr. Waddey is certainly not a flight risk. He's got Class B violations. He's satisfied one year, 11 months and two weeks of his supervised release. He reported — it sounded to me like more than the probation officer wanted him to. I almost got the feeling the probation officer felt like he was reporting too much, calling too much.

He owns property here. He has a job here. He has no record of flight. When the police showed up at his house and broke his door in, he willingly and voluntarily went along with them.

Today, and he also has a third-party custodian who's said he's willing to be sure he complies with — whatever orders the Court lays down and certainly those will include that he shows up whenever he's supposed to. I don't think there's any valid basis in the record for flight.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

As for danger, I think danger to

Ms. Stones would certainly be an issue based on the
allegations. The record undisputed before us is that
he's been told by both the Metro Davidson County court
system and by his probation officer to have absolutely
no contact with Ms. Stones, and he's done that. He
has had no contact with her whatsoever.

His father has participated -participated in a peaceful exchange of her belongings
and it appears to me, Your Honor, and appears from the
record that they have extricated each other from one
another's lives, so I don't think he's a danger to
Ms. Stones at all.

Certainly, the third-party custodian would be relevant in reporting any contact he would have with her as well. And I guess also this undercurrent that -- you know, and it's not even undercurrent. It's out there that this idea that Robert Waddey is a conspiracy-minded guy and, you

know, he's -- he's going to do bad stuff and the CO-VID thing has stressed him out and he's just kind of some crazy person that we've kind of got to get our arms around.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

But the record is also clear that none of the things that he has that the probation officer is so concerned about, none of that stuff is illegal. He's very mindful about his firearm restriction. Not only is it a violation of supervised release, it's a violation of federal law at this point for Mr. Waddey to have a firearm. So he doesn't. He knows that.

He wants to go live remotely. I think, frankly, that's not an uncommon position at this time. His probation officer says he can't, so he didn't. He is concerned about his ability to defend his home. And I will note that every one of these items were found on his person or in his home.

And, frankly, the items that might cause the Court the most concern were found in his home and he's concerned about his ability to defend his home. But he's not committing crimes and he's not — he's not violating any laws in this process. The fact is, Your Honor, it's legal and it's acceptable — and maybe some people, you know, have a different preference. It's legal and acceptable to be

conspiracy-minded and to have fears and concerns about the government and to take precautions for some sort of societal disruption. There is no law or rule that says he can't do that. And I will submit that several people in our country are doing just that right now.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

But in any event, regardless of how one may personally feel about that mindset, certainly it's not a basis to keep someone in jail. To the extent it's relevant to some sort of mental health concerns, I think the proof is that Robert Waddey has a current and ongoing relationship with Dr. Kyger. His probation officer testified to that. And that he is and has been in outpatient treatment pretty much all throughout his supervised release.

So is it working as well as they want it to? I think that depends on how you look at it. Has he completely 100 percent never touched alcohol again? No, but that's not the nature of recovery, that's not the nature of addiction. I do think he's got a job, he's holding down a steady job, and he's living responsibly.

I certainly think there is a plan in place for Your Honor to release Mr. Waddey and to allow him to fight this petition from a -- from outside the jail.

should do about the fact that Mr. Waddey was previously in the custody — pretrial release custody of his parents, his third-party custodians, there was a condition that he not use alcohol excessively and then he appeared at the sentencing hearing with a blood alcohol content level of .173. Why should I have confidence at this point that Mr. Waddey, Gary Waddey, despite his best intentions, would be able to make sure that Robert Waddey complies with the conditions of release given that that was an unsuccessful venture before?

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

MR. FARMER: Well, because I think — well, a couple reasons. One, Mr. Waddey has gone through much more treatment and therapy than he had at that time. Secondly, you know, regardless of how this supervised release petition pans out, there will never be anything in Mr. Waddey's life that is as stressful and emotional as a federal sentencing hearing. It was his first experience with that. He had no idea how or what was going to happen.

Federal sentence is a scary proposition for anybody. It's a scary proposition for me as a lawyer. So for a 22-year-old kid who -- or 22 or 23, however old he was at the time, 22 or 23-year-old kid,

he hadn't really been in trouble before, so standing before a judge on a plea hearing not knowing what was going to happen, I can imagine how he'd be freaked out.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

But Mr. Waddey has grown, he's evolved.

He's had the benefit of treatment. He's not perfect,

but he's trying. And I think the fact that he's

repeatedly and regularly in contact with his probation

officer, I think he does try. He wants to do right.

I think Gary Waddey understands the -- both the

seriousness that his son faces now and the seriousness

that will be in his future if -- if Robert drinks.

And — and I guess lastly, I think the nature of the supervision prior was kind of a daily check—in. As I understood from Your Honor's questioning, you're more inclined, if you are to release him, to have him kind of residing with his parents. So there would be a greater level of supervision there as well.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Suedekum? Do you want to address the detention factors?

MR. SUEDEKUM: Yes, Your Honor. Just quickly. First, to quickly circle back on the preliminary hearing issue, the -- I would submit the

difference between what happened on March 15 and why an arrest warrant was issued two days later was that the victim came back, expressed an interest and willingness to want to go forward with pressing charges and submitted a sworn affidavit in order to have the warrant issued.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

In contrast to what Ms. Stones reported both to police and under oath in the affidavit,
Mr. Waddey has offered two different stories, first the story to the police that they were wrestling, and then second later telling the probation officer that it wasn't an assault at all, that it was an entirely different situation that led to, you know, her being upset and contacting the police.

And so I would submit that a sworn statement from the victim, especially when Mr. Waddey has given inconsistent explanations for what happened is enough to show probable cause that he had committed an offense. I certainly recognize that whether or not the State can ultimately prove that beyond a reasonable doubt is yet to be determined.

That's not the standard here. The standard is simply whether there's probable cause to believe it. The fact that Mr. Waddey was arrested on a warrant finding probable cause to believe that, I

believe is strong evidence that that violation has been established here.

The other two, Your Honor, I won't belabor those points.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

As for the detention issue, Your Honor, I've spoken with probation at great length about Mr. Waddey's case, and we have spent a decent amount of time talking about Mr. Waddey's beliefs and his fears and, in some cases, his paranoia about events. And as Mr. Farmer pointed out, this is not an attempt to punish or say anything about Mr. Waddey's views or what he believes, other than the risk that it poses potentially to others, as well as himself, Your Honor.

That's one of the factors that needs to be taken into consideration. When you look at the items that were located in his home, the fact that he had a door-breaching tool, that there is a tear gas canister, the fact that he had airsoft pistols, certainly in -- and Mr. Waddey elected not to testify, he didn't have to. I expect Mr. Waddey's explanation would be I can't own a firearm, but I need some way to protect myself. So these are items that I can have. Maybe that would be the story, maybe he has a different explanation.

From the government's standpoint, looking

at the detention question, these are potential weapons. These are things that can be potentially used to harm himself. And the presence of those items in the home, along with his struggles and his use and consumption of alcohol creates a potentially dangerous situation for him and for other people.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

And the Court, I think, hit the nail on the head that previously Mr. Waddey was on pretrial release prior to pleading guilty, being sentenced. And that ultimately his supervision was revoked as a result of — I think, Judge Crenshaw's order indicated consuming three pints of alcohol, of vodka I think is what the order said.

And so the government submits that given the defendant's conduct while on supervised release that there has been a pattern of violations. And I would submit that the domestic violence arrest, that warrant is probably the most serious of them.

The totality of the circumstances,

Your Honor, is that on sort of a fairly consistent
basis Mr. Waddey has had trouble complying with the
conditions of his supervised release, resulting in
several petitions submitted to the Court. This is, I
think, the first one that has — the Court has elected
to take action on since November 2018, which was

reflective of attempting to give Mr. Waddey time to sort things out on his own and follow the conditions and get with the program. But he's continued to have issues, he's continued to have violations and for that reason, Your Honor, we do believe detention is appropriate here.

2.0

2.1

2.4

To the extent the Court is entertaining allowing Mr. Waddey to be released, we do believe that (indiscernible) third-party custodian so that he has fairly constant supervision is appropriate here. We would also ask that Mr. Waddey, if he continues to work, that he be allowed to leave to go to work, but that otherwise that he would effectively be on home confinement so that he would be at home to help minimize the risk of any other further issues to the extent the Court is considering that route.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else, then, Mr. Farmer?

MR. FARMER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything that you'd like to add, Mr. Foster?

MR. FOSTER: Your Honor, I would like to add some information on the last point.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. FOSTER: If the Court is inclined to

request any type of home confinement, again, as I mentioned before, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected some of the ways that the probation office is able to (indiscernible) activities including various means of home confinement.

2.0

2.1

2.4

As I mentioned right now, probation officers aren't going into individuals' homes. So we would have difficulty installing or maintaining any home confinement equipment. If the Court were inclined to try to utilize any other form of home confinement, we would have to be sure that the residence could technically accommodate some of those forms, such as having a landline, if he would be on voice ID. But, again, I would answer any questions the Court had if the Court was inclined to order any (indiscernible).

THE COURT: Mr. Foster, what is the recommendation of the probation office with respect to detention pending revocation? Anything that you want to add to what Mr. Suedekum has already stated as the position of the government?

MR. FOSTER: I concur with the points raised by Mr. Suedekum. With regard to the ongoing nature, elements of noncompliance on Mr. Waddey's part, I'm particularly concerned by the presence of

the items found in his home. I'm concerned with what has become of those items.

2.0

2.1

2.4

I'm concerned with not only that

(indiscernible) Mr. Waddey was so close to, as far as he knew, pushing (indiscernible), he openly possessed items which he well knows have been major issues on supervised release. His probation officer

(indiscernible) had any of those items been encountered in the home, recommendation for action would have been requested on that basis. I think that — you know, I concur with the government's recommendation for detention, and it would be my hope that the matter would be resolved before

Judge Crenshaw to his satisfaction as soon as possible.

THE COURT: Mr. Suedekum or Mr. Farmer,
do you know, is Judge Crenshaw setting revocation
hearings and conducting those remotely at this time?

MR. SUEDEKUM: I'm not sure, Your Honor.
I know that he's conducting some hearings by video
conference, and so this might be — that might be the
type of hearing that he would schedule by video
conference. I do know, it was in a different case,
but about two weeks ago we did — there was an
in-person hearing where several defense attorneys and

one attorney for the government appeared to discuss resetting a trial that was being moved.

2.0

2.1

2.4

So I don't know whether he is attempting to still hold some hearings in person or whether he's doing them by video conference right now.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SUEDEKUM: As far as I know, he has not set a hearing yet.

MR. FOSTER: Your Honor, if I could interject, I have participated in a hearing involving revocation that was conducted by Judge Crenshaw as recently as not last week, but late the week before. And it is my understanding that he's using available options to go ahead and hold hearings, particularly for individuals who are in custody. I believe those would be conducted either telephonically or video conference. Ultimately I would not want to speak for him. I'm just letting you know what I've become aware of.

THE COURT: I appreciate it. I didn't take it as you speaking for him, Mr. Foster. I appreciate that you updated me. I know that there are some matters that are being conducted telephonically or by video, but I also know there's some matters that are being postponed, so.

I'm going to take a brief recess and come back and give you my decision this afternoon. Give me about five or ten minutes and everyone just hold on. If you want to, you can disconnect your video so that you're not seeing each other and audio, but — and that's what I'm going to do, but I will come back and resume in about five or ten minutes.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

(Whereupon, a break was taken.)

THE COURT: All right. This is Judge Holmes, I'm ready to reconvene.

All right. I have looked at all of the documents and gone back and looked at the record in this case and I'm prepared to make my findings and conclusions which are guided by Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.1(a)(6), which requires that I consider whether Mr. Waddey can be released without posing a danger to any other person or the community or without likelihood of flight by a clear and convincing standard, which is his burden to — which is his burden to satisfy.

And for the reasons I'm about to state,

I do find that Mr. Waddey has carried his burden. But

let me say this -- start out by saying, I do find that

there's probable cause to believe that Mr. Waddey

violated the conditions of release as alleged in the

petition.

2.0

2.1

2.4

The arguments that Mr. Farmer makes about the sufficiency of the arrest warrant and the circumstances upon which it rests are all arguments that are more appropriately suited to defense in that matter or to a determination by Judge Crenshaw of whether the -- whether there has been a violation, an adjudication of a violation.

For purposes of probable cause, which the standard is very low, I find that there is probable cause to find that Mr. Waddey violated the conditions of release as alleged in the complaint.

All right. With respect to -- so then the question is whether Mr. Waddey ought to be released or detained. And I do find that Mr. Waddey has carried his burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence that there are conditions of release that I can impose that would reasonably assure the safety of the community and his appearance in court.

I am going to tell you, it is a high standard, and Mr. Waddey has satisfied that standard by the barest minimum possible of clear and convincing. And frankly, the reason why the Court makes that finding is the willingness of Gary Waddey

I am convinced after the testimony today and viewing the entire record in this matter that it is only with the support of Gary Waddey and -- I'm sorry,

Mr. Waddey, your wife's name has escaped my fingertips here.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

But it is only with the support of his parents that Robert Waddey is going to finish up his supervised release successfully and turn a corner and put this whole matter behind him. And -- Paula Waddey. And because Gary Waddey is willing to be a third-party custodian, including willing to go stay at Robert Waddey's house to provide a more intensive level of custodianship, that the Court finds that there has been a clear and convincing showing of a basis to release Robert Waddey pending the revocation hearing.

Let me just go through some of the Court's considerations. For the last several months it appears — at least up until the COVID—19 situation, it appears that Mr. Waddey had been reasonably compliant; although, certainly the new alleged violation is very serious.

I do want to say with respect to
Mr. Farmer's comments about Judge Crenshaw having

found that the previous drug screens and the previous use of alcohol was not serious enough to do any more than just take no action, while the Court can certainly take any action on any petition brought by the probation officer, generally the Court accepts the recommendations of the probation office.

2.0

2.1

2.4

And I'm quite certain that the defense bar has no desire for either the probation office or the Court to start revoking supervised release or revoking pretrial release based on marijuana positive drug screens or use of alcohol screens. So I don't place any weight whatsoever on Judge Crenshaw having taken no prior action with respect to those alleged violations in this case.

It is always the situation that if there are later more serious alleged violations, that those previous violations are taken into the Court — taken into consideration by the Court at that time in considering the totality of a defendant's likely compliance with conditions of release.

Again, I do find that because of the willingness of Gary Waddey to be a third-party custodian, that is the tipping point for the Court.

But for Gary Waddey's willingness to do that -- I want to tell you, Robert Waddey, that but for the

willingness of your father to be a third-party custodian, I would be detaining you at this point.

2.0

2.1

2.4

I do find that that's a very significant factor that pushes this case into the clear and convincing realm and satisfies that burden because I do believe that it is your father's support and willingness to be a third-party custodian and to hold you to the conditions of your supervised release that clearly and convincingly establishes that you — that I can impose — that and other conditions of release that will reasonably mitigate against any danger to the community and ensure your appearance in court.

I'm also taking into consideration the fact that Mr. Waddey's supervised release would otherwise have expired on May 31 of 2020. I do find merit in Mr. Foster's statements that it is concerning that with two months left to go on his supervised release that Robert Waddey appears to be in possession of items that might be considered to be contraband.

And I'm not taking that lightly or minimizing that, but at this point the remaining period of Mr. Waddey's supervised release is very short, at least up to this point. And so the Court finds that that's an additional basis that supports that he be released at this time.

Also, the fact that there is an order of protection in place, but I'm also going to restrict Mr. Waddey's contact with Ms. Stones and his small children, whether or not the order of protection remains in place by the state court.

2.0

2.1

2.4

I'm also going to require that he receive some mental health treatment between now and the revocation hearing and that he comply and consistently participate in and follow the recommendations of the mental health providers. So these are going to be the conditions upon which Mr. Waddey's going to be released. And Gary Waddey, are you still there?

Because I want you to listen to these conditions.

MR. GARY WADDEY: I am.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to have Mr. Foster send to you a copy of the supervised release conditions so that you have all of those, because they're going to be incorporated in this order. And they will be additional conditions, even though they won't be separately recited in this order, but Mr. Foster can send those to you so that you'll have those. You are going to get a copy of this order.

And, Mr. Farmer, the way this is working is I will need you to make sure that you provide to

Mr. Waddey a third-party custodian affirmation, and I'll fill it out and then Mr. Waddey will need to sign it and return it to you, Mr. Farmer, and then you will need to provide that to Ms. Cox so that she can file it at that point.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Mr. Waddey, if you would give me -- well, let me go through the conditions of release because I want to have you confirm one more time, Gary Waddey, that you are still willing to be your son's third-party custodian. And just for ease of reference, Robert, let me just say to you that I'm -- this probably echos what you heard from Judge Newbern when she released you on pretrial release into your parents' custody that you now have involved your parents in your legal situation and potentially put their own legal stability in jeopardy some. That's very serious.

And it is not the ordinary course of things that parents have to step back into a role of being an everyday parent for their adult children. That's not the way it's supposed to work. When our children get to be adults, we should have some level of confidence that we can — they can go out into the world and take care of themselves and remain law-abiding, productive citizens without needing our

oversight and parenting --

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. Who said Your Honor?

I'm sorry, I thought I heard someone say Your Honor.

All right.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

So I just want to be sure, Robert Waddey, that you appreciate how serious this is for your father to be willing to step back into this role and assume the role of a parent again as if you hadn't yet reached the age of 18. It's going to be a very intensive parental role. I'm going to require that he spend the nights at your house and that he very actively provide supervision of your compliance with the conditions of release between now and the time of the revocation hearing.

So I'm going to release you on your own recognizance, Mr. Waddey, Robert Waddey. You're going to remain on the conditions of supervised release that have previously been imposed by the district judge.

Mr. Foster will provide a copy of those to Gary Waddey so that you have those.

And then in addition, Robert Waddey, you're going to abide by the following conditions pending a revocation hearing: You may not change your address or move without permission of probation office

or the Court. And that means you're going to reside at the 602 Dunston — is it Dunston Drive, Dunston Court, at that address, and may not move or change that address without permission of the probation office or the Court.

2.0

2.1

2.4

You must be in court each and every time you're instructed to be here and surrender to serve any additional sentence imposed. You cannot intimidate or harass any witness, victim, informant, juror or officer of the Court and cannot obstruct any criminal investigation. And there are very serious penalties if you should violate any of those conditions.

It is punishable by up to ten years in prison and a \$250,000 fine or both if you should obstruct a criminal investigation, tamper with a witness, victim, informant, retaliate or attempt to retaliate against a witness, victim, informant or attempt to intimidate a witness, victim, juror, informant or officer of the court. And the penalties for tampering, retaliation or intimidation are significantly more serious if they involve a killing or attempted killing.

You must not violate any local, state or federal law, and if you do, you could be punished by

as much as from 90 days to ten years in prison, in addition to a \$250,000 fine, and any penalty provided for the offense committed.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

And that means everything from the most minor traffic offenses all the way up to new misdemeanor or felony charges of any kind. It's not to say that you would necessarily be returned to custody pending the revocation hearing if you get a traffic ticket, but it could be a violation. So you need to be sure that you're not violating any local, state or federal law.

And if you violate any condition of release, a warrant for your arrest could be issued, your own recognizance bond forfeited and new bonds with additional conditions or your detention until trial, which is the revocation hearing, could be ordered by the Court and you could be held in contempt.

And if you fail to appear at any proceeding in this case or fail to surrender to serve any sentence imposed, you could be charged and convicted of bail jumping, which applies equally to your own recognizance, and is punishable by in some cases by as much as ten years in prison and/or a fine in addition to any other punishments imposed in your

original case.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

And then these are the additional conditions with which you're going to comply: You shall maintain or actively seek employment. You shall have no contact with Andrea Stokes (sic), either directly or indirectly outside the presence of your attorney, nor shall you have any unsupervised visitation with your minor children.

For as long as the order of protection is in place, you have to comply with that order of protection, Mr. Waddey, but even if the order of protection is lifted by the state court, I am imposing the condition that you'll have no contact with Andrea Stokes — Stokes — I think it's Stones, actually, either directly or indirectly. That means no social media contact with her, no texting her, no sending messages to her.

So Gary Waddey, if you find that your son has been communicating with Ms. Stones on Instagram or Snapchat, that's a violation of the conditions of release and that has to be reported.

And I think the order of protection extends to the minor children too, but I -- even if it doesn't, because having any visitation with those children would otherwise require contact with

Ms. Stones, I'm going to restrict you from having any unsupervised visitation with them.

2.0

2.1

2.2.

2.4

You will not travel outside the Middle District of Tennessee without the permission of the probation office.

And then Mr. Foster, are the other standard conditions about not possessing firearms, refraining from the unlawful use of narcotics and drug testing, those are all standard conditions of Mr. Waddey's supervised release that will remain in place; correct?

MR. FOSTER: That is correct.

may be the possibility that the revocation hearing does not occur until after the 31st of May, I'm going to go ahead and order those things, just so that there's no question about whether those conditions of supervised release remain in place. They will be conditions of his release pending the revocation hearing.

So I am going to --

MR. FOSTER: It's my understanding that until Judge Crenshaw reaches a resolution on the pending violation matter, Mr. Waddey will remain under supervision.

THE COURT: I'm supposing that's a correct statement of the law, but just so that there's no question about that, even if these are duplicative conditions, I'm going to impose them anyway. Just so that there's no question.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

So no travel outside the Middle District of Tennessee without prior approval of the probation office. So I don't know where your construction jobs are, if they include counties outside the Middle District of Tennessee, Mr. Waddey, but if they do, you would have to get permission from Mr. Foster to go to those jobs. And if you don't get permission, then you will need to not work those jobs.

I'm also going to say that you will provide the probation officer with a weekly schedule of your work, what hours and where; that you will refrain from possessing any firearm, ammunition, destructive device or other dangerous weapons.

So Gary Waddey, you have the right and, in fact, the responsibility as a third-party custodian, to be going through your son's room to make sure that he doesn't have any of those things. And if he does, he has to be reported to the probation office.

He's going to refrain from any use of

alcohol, so that means no use whatsoever. So there needs to be no alcohol in the house. And if your son comes home from work and he smells like beer, then that's going to be a violation that has to be reported.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

No use of any -- no possession or use of any unlawful narcotic drug. If you've got a prescription, that needs to be provided to Mr. Foster because he's going to continue to drug test you. You will submit to random drug testing, and you cannot obstruct or attempt to obstruct in any fashion with the efficiency or accuracy of the drug testing.

If Mr. Foster tells you that you have to participate in some kind of inpatient or outpatient substance abuse therapy and counseling, you have to follow that instruction. You also are going to participate in mental health evaluation treatment and program as deemed appropriate by the pretrial services officer — or probation officer.

So that means that -- I know there's been some resistance before, Robert Waddey, to you participating fully in mental health treatment, but that -- I know that Mr. Foster is going to be coordinating that with your mental health providers because that -- everyone wants that treatment to be as

productive and successful as possible.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

But if you are instructed by Mr. Foster to participate in mental health treatment based on the recommendations of your providers, then you need to be participating. And you need to be going to appointments and you need to be going to group sessions.

Yes, go ahead, Mr. Foster.

MR. FOSTER: Your Honor, along that line, I think that Mr. Waddey's supervision and all of the information that I've received from treatment providers thus far has shown rather conclusively that Mr. Waddey is not willing to engage with treatment providers other than Dr. Wilson and Dr. Kyger, nor would it be fruitful to make any further referrals.

So that end, I would request that Mr. Waddey, to whatever degree he may not have been receiving treatment from those doctors up until the time of his arrest, I would ask that he be ordered to resume treatment with those providers. And that he provide me with a list of his treatment schedule and that after each appointment he obtain some form of proof that he did attend treatment.

That way we would not be in a position where in order to meet your -- fulfill your order we

1 were forced to -- we would have to refer him somewhere 2 other than where we know that he will already go. 3 THE COURT: All right. It's Dr. Kriger, 4 that's K-r-i-q-e-r; correct? 5 MR. FOSTER: I believe Kyger, K-y-g-e-r. 6 THE COURT: K-y-e-r? 7 MR. FOSTER: K-y-q-e-r. 8 THE COURT: All right. And then 9 Dr. Wilson is the other provider? 10 MR. FOSTER: Yes, that's my 11 understanding; although, if there is another treatment 12 provider who's already in the mix, I think now would 13 be the time to disclose that so that can be part of 14 the record. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Farmer, are there any 16 other mental health providers with whom Mr. Waddey 17 would be willing to participate in treatment? 18 MR. FARMER: I don't -- I don't know of 19 one, Your Honor. Those are the two I know of. 2.0 THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to 2.1 order that Mr. Waddey will resume treatment 22 immediately with Dr. Kyger and Dr. Wilson. 23 will provide a schedule of weekly appointments to 2.4 Mr. Foster and then confirmation that he kept that 25 appointment.

And, Gary Waddey, if that means that your son needs to miss work to go to appointments with his mental health providers, then he's going to need to miss work. And I'm even going to put that, that he'll maintain or seek employment except as necessary to receive mental health treatment.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

That's going to be the most important thing at this point, Robert Waddey, is that you get back into treatment with Dr. Kyger and Dr. Wilson and that you keep — you make appointments with them and you keep those appointments with them. And follow their recommendations.

All right. Then report as soon as possible and no later than 48 hours to the supervising officer any contact with law enforcement personnel, including but not limited to any arrests, questioning or traffic stop. So any kind of contact with law enforcement of any kind. If you're in a car and you go through a roadblock and they stop the driver, that's contact because you're in the car, though, so you have to report that.

Something happens in your neighborhood and the police are questioning you, even if it has nothing to do with you, that's contact. And certainly any contact as a result of your own conduct has to be

reported.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

And you'll permit probation officers to visit at any time at your home or elsewhere without advance notification and permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view. You will be placed in the third party custody of Gary Waddey, to reside at the defendant's current residence with Gary Waddey.

Mr. Foster — oh, and I'm going to say other than work, scheduled court appointment, court hearings, medical or mental health appointments, religious services or appointments with his lawyer, that he'll be subject to home confinement with the monitoring to be at the discretion of probation office, Mr. Foster. So you can figure out however best you need to monitor that. And that will be completely within your discretion.

Go ahead, Mr. Foster.

MR. FOSTER: I would suggest that given the nature of the third-party custodian with which Mr. Waddey is being released, I think that ordering him to remain at home, other than for those times (indiscernible) would be sufficient.

Even with the limited types of monitoring the probation office could offer right now, I don't think it would be (indiscernible) the level of

monitoring that his father is currently offering. I would only advise or request that his father agree to remain in touch with me and while we're in this hearing provide me with his cell phone number so I can conduct a follow-up call as soon as the hearing is complete.

2.0

2.1

2.4

THE COURT: We're going to get his cell phone number. I'm going to leave in the monitoring at the discretion of the probation office, Mr. Foster, because then that gives you the ability to say contact by Gary Waddey is sufficient monitoring, that's all you need. But if at some point you think you need to step up the level of monitoring, then you can do that as well. I'm just going to leave that and leave it up to your discretion.

All right. And the procedure,
Mr. Farmer, is going to be that I'm going to enter a
separate release order and conditions of release with
all of these conditions. I'm going to send you the
one for Robert Waddey to sign, and then you will
return that to the Court once he's signed it. And
then I'll do a supplemental order that files that with
the Court to show that he has reviewed all the
conditions of release.

But let me ask a couple of things first.

1 Robert Waddey, you heard the conditions of release and 2 the penalties for noncompliance. And do you 3 understand all of the conditions of release and the 4 penalties if you fail to comply? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: And do I have your agreement 7 that you will obey all the conditions of release to 8 appear as directed and to surrender to serve any 9 sentence imposed? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. So then 12 Mr. Farmer is going to give you -- and that will be 13 another condition that you will have to sign and 14 return to your attorney these conditions of release. 15 All right. And Gary Waddey, having heard 16 all of these conditions of release now, are you still 17 willing to be a third-party custodian for your son? 18 MR. GARY WADDEY: Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. 2.0 MR. GARY WADDEY: And thank you for your 2.1 decision. I did want you to add, if you would, 22 please, my wife, Paula. 23 I can do that. THE COURT: 2.4 MR. GARY WADDEY: And she is willing. 25 we need to sign any documents, she will be willing to

do so.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: All right. And one of the two of you needs to -- I really feel, Mr. Waddey -- and I say this as a mother. I really feel like adult sons pay more attention to their father than they do to their mothers. I can say that as the mother of a 33-year-old adult son. So my preference would be that I will place him in the third-party custodian of both of you but that you be the one that is at his house in the evenings with him and spending the night with him. So I'm going to include that in the conditions of release. All right.

MR. GARY WADDEY: Well, yes. But I do have to travel on Fridays. I have to be at a different location, so that's why it needs to have both of us.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GARY WADDEY: And, again,

occasionally I do have to travel.

THE COURT: So what I'm going to say is unless you're out of town, and then it will be Paula Waddey who can spend the night. Hopefully this won't go on very long and Judge Crenshaw will set an early revocation hearing.

All right. And what is your address, you

```
1
     and Paula Waddey's address, Mr. Waddey?
 2
                   MR. GARY WADDEY:
                                     Yes.
                                           Judge, our
 3
     address is 4716 Lealand Lane, L-e-a-l-a-n-d, Lane.
 4
     And that is Nashville 37220.
 5
                   THE COURT: All right. And your -- do
 6
     you have a home telephone number?
 7
                   MR. GARY WADDEY: Yes. The home number
 8
     is (615) 292-4626.
 9
                   THE COURT: And your cell number?
10
                   MR. GARY WADDEY: Is -- my cell number is
11
      (615) 945-5946.
12
                   THE COURT: And your wife's cell phone
13
     number?
14
                   MR. GARY WADDEY:
                                     Is (615) 945-5947.
15
                   THE COURT: All right. Mr. Farmer is
16
     going to send you this form that says upon finding
17
     that release to a third-party custodian will assure
18
     the appearance of the defendant and the safety of
19
     other persons in the community, I'm ordering that he
2.0
     will be released subject to the following conditions
2.1
     placed in your third-party custody; that you agree to
22
     supervise your son in accordance with all the
2.3
     conditions of release, to use every effort to assure
2.4
     his appearance at all scheduled court proceedings and
```

to notify the Court immediately in the event that he

25

violates any conditions of release or disappears.

2.0

2.1

2.4

And that you understand that your failure to abide by this agreement may subject you to contempt of court proceedings. So Mr. Farmer is going to provide you with this form. You'll need to sign it immediately and send it back. And if you don't do that, then Mr. Suedekum is going to take further action to ask the Court to reconsider -- I'm quite certain that Mr. Suedekum will do that if he doesn't get this form back, particularly given the Court's findings about the importance of this third-party custodian arrangement.

All right.

MR. GARY WADDEY: Do you need my email address?

THE COURT: It probably would be helpful for Mr. Foster to have that and for Mr. Farmer to have it. So let me -- actually, I probably have it because -- was it gwaddey@comcast.net?

MR. GARY WADDEY: That's correct, ma'am. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: All right. So that's the address to which Mr. Foster can send the supervised release conditions and Mr. Farmer can send the other paperwork that you need to sign and be aware of.

1 Anything else, Mr. Foster? 2 MR. FOSTER: One, could you repeat that 3 email address one more time? 4 THE COURT: Yes, it's gwaddey, 5 q-w-a-d-d-e-y, at comcast.net. 6 MR. FOSTER: And the last matter would 7 be -- and it would be nice if we could get someone in 8 the marshals lockup on this, is when exactly 9 Mr. Waddey will be released. I understand that he was 10 brought from a local jail today. I'm not -- I want to 11 make sure whether or not he's going to released now or 12 tomorrow. 13 THE COURT: I think the requirement is 14 that Davidson County does not let him -- they don't 15 release him from here, that he'll have to go back and 16 be released from there. And I'm not sure, given the 17 time of day, if that will happen this afternoon or if 18 it will happen in the morning. 19 Mr. Farmer, do you know the answer to 2.0 that? 2.1 MR. FARMER: I do not know, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. I don't --2.3 MR. FARMER: Frankly, I would expect them 2.4 to release him tonight. Just knowing Davidson County, 25 they tend to shuffle people out as quick as we can,

but I don't know for sure.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Well, we're providing the release order to the marshal, but I don't know the answer to that. Mr. Farmer, you'll need to contact the marshal and Davidson County and make arrangements because Mr. Waddey will need to be there to pick up — oh, wait a minute, I see a hand. Is there — go ahead.

MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor. This is Robin Romaniuk with the US Marshals.

THE COURT: Yes.

MARSHAL: And he was housed at Davidson County, and so we will send him back there, but he will be released subject to being booked out of their system as soon as he gets back.

THE COURT: Okay. And so Mr. Waddey or Mr. Farmer -- Gary Waddey or Mr. Farmer, you need to be there to pick him up. And then he'll need to -- he'll be -- so that he can be released into one -- not just to be released back out onto the street. There needs to be someone there to pick him up and take him back home. All right? Which it's really -- I'll leave that up to you. That's really outside the Court's purview, but I'll leave that up to you.

MR. GARY WADDEY: That will not be a

problem.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: All right. Anything else,
Mr. Suedekum or Mr. Foster?

MR. SUEDEKUM: No, Your Honor. I'll just — for the record, I started having video issues at some point while you were going through the conditions, and so I logged out and logged back in. It looked like I was probably the only one having the issue, so as long as everybody else was able to hear everything, I don't have any issues.

THE COURT: I think everybody was. And I'll -- you will see an order from me probably not today because I've got a whole slough of search warrants that are waiting for my review, but probably sometime in the morning we'll get the order -- release order entered and all of the conditions of release will be recited in that.

And then all the -- Mr. Farmer, it's going to be up to you to make sure all of this paperwork gets to the people it needs to get to and gets signed by the people it needs to be signed by and then gets returned to the Court because, again, if you don't do that, then there's a very good possibility that Mr. Suedekum is going to be asking for the Court to reconsider or set a status conference or take some

1	action to make sure that everyone's compliant with
2	what's expected.
3	MR. FARMER: Yes, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: All right. Anything else
5	from you, Mr. Farmer, that we need to address this
6	afternoon?
7	MR. FARMER: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
8	THE COURT: All right, then. Anything
9	else, Mr. Foster, from you?
10	MR. FOSTER: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We'll
12	be in recess.
13	***END OF ELECTRONIC RECORDING***
14	
15	
16	
17	
<b>-</b> /	
18	
18 19	
18 19 20 21	
18 19 20 21 22	
18 19 20 21 22 23	
18 19 20	

## 1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 3 I, Roxann Harkins, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Middle 4 5 District of Tennessee, in Nashville, do hereby 6 certify: 7 That I transcribed from **electronic** 8 recording the proceedings held via video conference on 9 May 19, 2020, in the matter of UNITED STATES OF 10 AMERICA v. ROBERT ELLIS WADDEY, Case No. 3:17-cr-025; 11 that said proceedings in connection with the 12 hearing were reduced to typewritten form by me; and 13 that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate 14 transcript of said proceedings. 15 16 This is the 2nd day of July, 2020. 17 s/ Roxann Harkins 18 ROXANN HARKINS, RPR, CRR 19 Official Court Reporter 2.0 2.1 22 2.3 2.4 25